ROME'S TRIBUTE

TO

ANGLICAN ORDERS

A DEFENCE OF THE EPISCOPAL SUCCESSION AND PRIESTHOO
OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND, FOUNDED ON THE
TESTIMONY OF THE BEST ROMAN
CATHOLIC AUTHORITIES.

BY

REV. MONTAGU R. BUTLER,

Author of "The Mennonite Brethren: a Brief History of the Baptists"
"Protestant Recruits," etc., etc.

THIRD EDITION—REVISED AND ENLARGED.

INTRODUCTORY CRITICISM OF CERTAIN ATTACKS MA
ON THE SECOND EDITION).

BX
5178
B87
1894
GTU
Storage

Library of the
Church Divinity School
of the Pacific

UA66
B986

Class UA66 B986 (c.2)
ift
8

21113
(

Library of the
Church Divinity School
of the Pacific

ROME'S TRIBUTE

TO

ANGLICAN ORDERS:

A DEFENCE OF THE EPISCOPAL SUCCESSION AND PRIESTHOOD OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND, FOUNDED ON THE TESTIMONY OF THE BEST ROMAN CATHOLIC AUTHORITIES.

BY

REV. MONTAGU R. BUTLER,

Author of "The Mennonite Brethren: a Brief History of the Baptists," "Protestant Recruits," etc., etc.

THIRD EDITION—REVISED AND ENLARGED.

(WITH AN INTRODUCTORY CRITICISM OF CERTAIN ATTACKS MADE ON THE SECOND EDITION).

CHURCH DIVINITY SCHOOL of the PACIFIC LIBRARY

London:

THE CHURCH DEFENCE INSTITUTION,

6, BRIDGE STREET, WESTMINSTER.

1894.

GRADUATE THEOLOGICAL UNION LIBRARY 1962

BX
5178
B87
894

PREFATORY NOTE.

"ROME'S TRIBUTE TO ANGLICAN ORDERS" first appeared in the pages of the *Indian Church Quarterly Magazine* in the year 1889. The interest evinced in it at the time, as also many subsequent applications for a reprint, led the compiler to obtain the editor's kind permission for the publication of the treatise in an enlarged and revised form.

Various works have appeared from time to time proving the validity of Anglican Orders from the *Anglican* standpoint. A very handy little volume on the subject is furnished in Canon W. R. Churton's "Defence of the English Ordinal." For a more exhaustive treatment of the subject such a work as the Rev. Arthur W. Haddan's "Apostolical Succession in the Church of England" may be consulted with advantage. The present little publication adopts the method of producing concurrent testimony of learned members of the *Roman* Communion respecting the facts which Anglican writers have upheld. To the Rev. Dr. F. G. Lee's interesting volume, "The Validity of the Holy Orders of the Church of England," the compiler is indebted for some valuable testimonies, whilst his attention has been drawn (in part by the same work), to many other sources of information. He desires also gratefully to acknowledge the important aid which has been personally afforded him in his researches by the Rev. C. H. Ross Lewin and other members of the Priesthood, both English and Roman.

UA66
B986

INTRODUCTION.

THE second edition of this compilation, which was published on January 1st, 1893, apparently caused no little alarm among some of the adherents of the Italian propaganda in England, who were unable to share the views of their co-religionists to which I had drawn attention. The first indication of this reached me as early as February 14th of the same year, in a communication which spoke of a certain Father Clarke, S.J., as having "announced at the Hall in connection with the Pro-Cathedral" that he was going to examine my publication at a meeting that week. Whether the meeting took place at Kensington, or what was the character of this gentleman's investigation, I have not heard. However, on April 28th I received a letter from another quarter telling me "Father Breen is lecturing at Archbishop's House, Westminster, next Monday at 8 p.m. on 'Rome's Tribute to Anglican Orders.'"

Judging by the press notices of the Westminster Meeting on May 1st, 1893, no efforts were spared by the Roman brethren to make it a success. The chair was taken by His Eminence Cardinal Vaughan (Archbishop of Westminster), who was supported by the Right Rev. Monsignor James Laird Patterson (Bishop of Emmaus); Right Rev. Monsignor Daniel Gilbert, D.D. (Provost of the Metropolitan Chapter and Vicar-General); Very Rev. Monsignor Martin Howlett, D.D. (Registrar of the Deceased Clergy Association); Very Rev. Canon Moyes, D.D.; Rev. Philip Fletcher, of Walworth (Master of the Guild of Our Lady of Ransom); Rev. W. Croke Robinson (of the Pro-Cathedral, Kensington); Rev. Father Breen, O.S.B.; Rev. Richard Clarke, S.J.; Rev. Father Gurdon, Rev. John S. Vaughan, and Rev. Luke Rivington. And all this august assembly was called together to discuss a little publication which one of their own

2113

organs, the *Catholic Times*, says contains "all the old fairy tales of history, as though they had never been refuted and disposed of"! Surely there must be some mistake here, or why all this excitement? Is it reasonable to suppose that the company of prelates and priests met at the Cardinal's house, like so many children, to hear fairy tales? The *Universe* tells us that "the Lecture Hall was crowded to its utmost limits," and the *Echo* records that the audience "followed Father Breen's dry-as-dust citations with all the enthusiasm of first-nighters at a play." The *Catholic News* tells of how "very grateful" the Cardinal was to Father Breen for his "admirable" paper, and gives an account of an after-discussion in which Canon Moyes is represented as delivering himself of the statement that "the word schism means an authoritative act by which the Church cuts off what it believes to be a peccant member of its own body." The Cardinal spent "a very pleasant evening."* Of Fr. Breen's lecture itself a long account is given in the *Catholic Times and Catholic Opinion*, which speaks of him as "the learned Benedictine," and characterises his utterances as "skilful treatment" and "eloquent peroration." However, from August to October in the same year, a conspicuous series of articles appeared in the *Church Review* in reply to this lecturer, which disposed of his extraordinary statements in so trenchant and masterly a way, as to leave me no necessity to deal with them. I do not know the writer of the articles (which are signed "Vincentius"), and their appearance was wholly unexpected by me; but I desire to express my gratitude to him for his kind and able defence of "Rome's Tribute."

But the matter did not rest here. So anxious were some of the Anglo-Roman clergy to hinder any small influence which my humble publication might exercise, that they busied themselves writing letters in different parts of the country to private individuals begging them not to give heed to it. Others set themselves the task of publishing their views by means of pamphlets and articles in Roman Catholic journals. Among these it may be well that I should notice, in the first place, an attack made on me by Fr. William Humphrey, S.J. It took

---

* *Catholic News*, May 6, 1893.

the form of a pamphlet,* the whole burden of whose 14 pages is to denounce me for a quotation to which I had drawn attention. But it is particularly noticeable that Mr. Humphrey suppresses the fact that the quotation (as shown in a foot-note of "Rome's Tribute," page 44) is not mine, but that of the Rev. A. Saunders Dyer in his "Sketches of English Nonconformity." I accordingly published the following letter in the *Illustrated Church News*, and posted copies to Mr. Humphrey and Mr. Dyer. It appeared in the issue for December 23, 1893.

SIR,—In a work entitled "Sketches of English Nonconformity," by the Rev. A. Saunders Dyer, that author writes, "Even some Roman Catholics are able to see that the English Church is a continuous Church, and that the Reformation did not destroy that continuity. A member of the congregation of the Oblates of St. Charles, in a book bearing the imprimatur of Cardinal Manning, is just enough to confess 'I do not defend the position (*i.e.*, the position of the Roman Church in England), I do not think,'" &c. The passage which had struck Mr. Dyer seemed to me also, as quoted by him, to furnish the *presumption* that the writer (the Rev. W. Humphrey) at least believed in the continuity of the English Church, and consequently in the validity of her orders. It was in this sense only that I drew attention to the passage in "Rome's Tribute to Anglican Orders."

I was, however, careful in a foot-note to show that the words were given on the authority of Mr. Saunders Dyer's quotation only. I, of course, merely produced Mr. Humphrey's words for what they might be worth, in no way setting forth that I attached any *special* importance to them. I have just received from Mr. Humphrey a little tract called "Dishonest Controversy," in which he attacks me with much acrimony about the passage; but, for reasons best known to himself, ignores my foot-note. To his own work I had not had opportunities of direct access, and I had no reason to believe that the above-mentioned utterances of Mr. Dyer respecting the passage were "dishonest." I can only conclude that Mr. Dyer had not noticed certain other passages to which Mr. Humphrey now refers in his little tract—passages which express contempt for the idea of any true continuity in the English Church. In them, by his own showing, he heaps insult on the Church and ridicules her clergy.

Under the circumstances, I can quite understand Mr. Humphrey's annoyance that an impression arising from the indicated passage, meant more than he intended to imply; and I am sorry if I have seemed unjust in accrediting him with a larger measure of kindly sentiment respecting the English Church than he claims to possess.

---

* Dishonest Controversy; an exposure of "Rome's Tribute to Anglican Orders." By Father Humphrey, S.J.

To the objections of a few other Roman writers I do not at present reply. They do not possess the same character as that which attaches to the objection made by Mr. Humphrey. I propose, however, to refer to them in the next edition of my little work, in which Mr. Humphrey's utterance (in justice to his present contention) will, of course, not appear.—THE COMPILER OF "ROME'S TRIBUTE," &C.

Another attack, of which it may be well to take a little more notice, is that of Fr. S. F. Smith, S.J.,* though some little difficulty in dealing with it arises from the fact that, within a few weeks, it appeared both in the *Month*, and with the same title, but with certain important differences, as a [Roman] 'Catholic Truth' Tract, under the editorship of Rev. John Morris, S.J. It will be necessary, in some instances, to indicate the two versions of "Rome's Witness" (by which in this case is meant, I presume, the opinion of Mr. Smith) by the letters *A* and *B*.†

Mr. Smith (Witness *A*) commences his attack with the bold assumption that my little work is "written against the Catholic Church." Its title describes it as "*a Defence* of the Episcopal Succession and Priesthood of the Church of England." Eastern Catholic Bishops and Priests have needed no further explanation as to its import. On reading it they have concluded (as have Bishops and Priests of the Anglican Communion) that it is drawn up as a small contribution to the interesting question of the re-union of Christendom.

Having set forth his own version of its import, Mr. Smith does me the honour of classing me, as a writer, with Dr. Littledale, Mr. Gore and Mr. Lane. Yet I should be the last to make a bid for the fame and importance with which he thus invests my occasional publications. Witness *B* contains the condescendingly gracious admission that the Anglican clergy are "earnest, devoted, and well-intentioned men," but Witness *A* is more chary of compliments. Both versions of Mr. Smith, with all the solemnity which attaches to a judgment coming

---

* Rome's Witness against Anglican Orders. An Article in the *Month*, July, 1893.

† Historical Papers edited by the Rev. John Morris, S.J., No. XIV., Rome's Witness against Anglican Orders. By the Rev. Sydney F. Smith, S.J., pages 44.

from that quarter, "pronounce Mr. Butler's tract to be 'simply a work of fraud.'" I need not further dwell on such language than by drawing attention to the following caustic remarks in the *Religious Review of Reviews*:—"The charge of deliberate fraud that he brings against Mr. Butler is a breach of controversial etiquette, that we can only attribute to the indignation of a Roman who finds so many of his co-religionists arraigned to defend what he believes to be the weak point in the Anglican position."

To build up castles and knock them down may, under some circumstances, be pleasant occupation to the one who is engaged in it, and yet others may think it rather childish sport. Now, Mr. Smith (Witness *A*) says that my little work claims to produce "*all*" the best Roman Catholic authorities. He knows very well that this would be quite impossible, and one glance will show my readers that he has misrepresented me by adding that word "all." I am quite ready to hope it was merely a *lapsus calami* on his part; but the simple addition of that little word changes a reasonable claim into a preposterous one. If Mr. Smith desired to make his attack entertaining, there was surely no need for a facetious vein to betray him into so unfortunate a slip. Let us suppose him, when housekeeping, to say to his servant, "I wish you to bring a loaf and some butter from Mr. Brown's, and remember to purchase the tea at Mr. Jones' shop." The instruction seems simple enough. But what would be the consternation of Mr. Smith if the servant returned with a cart laden with tea? He would certainly not be unreasonable in remonstrating, "I did not bid you to purchase *all* the tea in Mr. Jones' shop."

On page 8 of "Rome's Tribute" I have quoted Dr. Newman in relation to the English Episcopal succession, and have specially drawn attention to the "equivocal" and "uncertain" ring of this good man's words on the subject, his declaration that he cannot "by his own wit acquiesce" in the view that Anglican Orders are valid, and his ignoring the action of certain popes. And yet because I have said that the ambiguous character of the language makes one suspicious as to the true nature of Newman's personal view of the subject, Mr. Smith greedily snatches upon the passage as representing one of my Roman Catholic testimonies to Anglican Orders. I am entirely satisfied to leave it

to unbiassed readers to judge whether I have so used Dr. Newman's words.

Mr. Smith takes a sudden jump into page 39, and, in face of the forcible quotations given by me from Dr. Lingard, would apparently suggest that the great historian never combatted the false allegations of Roman controversialists which I have quoted him as doing battle with. I can only say that I defy anyone to examine the works referred to and not find the passages respecting Barlow, the Nag's Head Fable, etc., which I have quoted. Lingard asserts with emphasis the "utter futility of any objection" brought against Parker's consecration, indignantly condemns the old Nag's Head Fable,* and definitely states Barlow to have been "a Catholic Bishop." Further, he places the reality of the episcopal character of Barlow and Gardiner on a par, and classes any suggestion as to invalidity in the former's ordinations among "these improbable, these incredible suppositions" of controversial opponents. I can nowhere find in Lingard's writings even so much as a hint that he doubted the validity of Anglican Orders. He does not go into the *theological* question at all, but as a writer of history simply establishes the facts which opponents of those Orders deny. His main point is apparently to contend for positive data rather than to enter on a theological disquisition. It seems strange indeed that such a circumstance should be seized upon by Mr. Smith to give colouring to a theory that Dr. Lingard, after what that historian describes as his "long and patient investigation," possibly did not believe in the reality of the Orders respecting which he produced a whole mass of confirmatory facts! Even if this were at all likely, Mr. Smith might do well to reflect on the learned writer's axiom that "no surmises or conjectures can possibly nullify a fact." On page 38

* First published as an attack on Anglican Orders by Christopher Holywood, S.J., in 1604. An article in the *Month* (July, 1893) by Rev. Edmund Hogan speaks of him as "this celebrated Jesuit, who had the reputation of an able man and great controversialist." Holywood appears to have carried on his work under the aliases John Bushlock, Jo-Busi, Thomas Lawndrie, etc., "to prevent his identification by the English," and, to judge by the evidence of even his own admissions (p. 402), to have been an adept in deceit.

I have quoted Estcourt's remarks, 1st, on the subject of a Resolution of the Congregation of the Holy Office; 2nd, on sacraments conferred by heretics; 3rd, on the Nag's Head Fable. I have in no way suggested that he admits one iota more than his words set forth. I have referred to him in defence of the fact of Parker's consecration, and this he declares "it is impossible to doubt." Mr. Smith passes over this admission; moreover, he disposes of the particular point by declaring on his own account "It is not necessary here to explain all the reasons for suspecting Parker's consecration." Under the circumstances of this marked disagreement with Canon Estcourt, how comes it that he (Witness *B*, page 14) declares the Canon's arguments to be convincing?

It is difficult to read Mr. Smith's publication side by sid with my own, as he does not take matters in their order. He now turns back to pages 6 and 7, and is angry with me for recounting the fact of the English Bishops having been invited to the Council of Trent. It will be seen by reference to my footnotes in the second edition, to which his remarks refer, that I have given ample references to historical evidence in support of the fact. Yet Mr. Smith ignores such items, and makes the mistake of asserting "It would have been more candid then for Mr. Butler to mention here (and elsewhere) that he was giving not a recognised fact, but merely his own interpretation of one." Anyone not having seen my little book, and reading such a sentence as this, would naturally imagine that I had put forth as an historical statement something unsupported by historical writers. But the value of evidence is not to be dispensed with by imputing dishonesty to me for producing it. However, if Mr. Smith requires additional authority for the record which he finds so distasteful, I may refer him to yet another historian, namely, Collier (see his "Ecclesiastical History," pp. 474, 475. Ed. 1714). Collier lays stress on the fact that when the Nuncio Martinengo met with the rebuff from Queen Elizabeth about sending Bishops to the Council, when it was "apparent the repose of Christendom lay strongly at his (the Pope's) heart," the Bishop of Viterbo, Nuncio at Paris, solicited Throgmorton to persuade Queen Elizabeth to change her mind. Collier mentions, moreover, that "she was likewise importuned by several

Princes and Great Men, by the Kings of France and Spain, and the King and Cardinal of Portugal, and more especially by the Duke of Alva, to rely upon *so solemn a representation of the Bishops of Christendom.*"

It is needless for me to deal with Witnesses *A* and *B* in relation to their attack on Section III. of my compilation, for the simple reason that the arguments (if such they may be called) are practically a mere reiteration of those of Mr. Breen, who has already been exhaustively answered in the *Church Review.*

Mr. Smith is anxious to show that certain language of Bonner meant less than the words clearly seem to me and others to imply. His method of dealing with him is to say that he "might have spoken his mind, whatever it was, more clearly," which is a remarkably neat (though not very conclusive) way of disposing of Bonner's open and definite recognition of certain facts, as recorded by the Roman Catholic historian, Lingard.

In support of facts, I have again, on page 11, referred to the testimony of no less than three well-known historians. Mr. Smith disputes the facts (as such), and refers me to another authority. I look to his foot-note, and see that the authority is —*himself!* Surely further comment is useless. In one part of his "Witness" he becomes almost amusing; for I find him admitting that a Cardinal's hat was twice offered to Laud, yet preferring to conclude that the offer could not have come from the Pope, who alone had the power to make it. With regard to the case of Father Cressy, he says: "*We may be sure* Father Cressy was re-ordained like everyone else." Again, with regard to the case of Dr. Gough, he says: "*We may be sure*, after all this, that Mr. Obadiah Walker, whoever he may be,* has misled us." But mere personal assurance of this kind is not argument.

Mr. Smith (Witness *A*) gives a letter purporting to come from Bishop Strossmayer. It is without date or commence-

---

* Dr. Obadiah Walker, although unknown to Mr. Smith, was a well known and distinguished man in his day, and was one of the authors of a Paraphrase of St. Paul's Epistles, which went through several editions. As a Reunionist, the authorities of his University seem to have been suspicious of his "introducing Popery"; in defence, however, he set forth a declaration of his position.

ment, and there is nothing to show where it comes from. Witness *B* gives the letter in a less fragmentary form, supplying a locality, *Rohic*, a date, July 1st, 1873, and a superscription, *Mademoiselle*. Thus the second version commences in French, proceeds in English, is signed with the German name, and is despatched from "Rohic." The publication "The Pope and the Gospel," from which I quoted, appeared, and was handed to me, in 1878. The gentleman (himself a publisher) who gave it to me knew of no earlier edition. The letter produced as a refutation is dated 1873, and neither specifies any document nor discourse by name or date; whilst there is also an utter absence of anything to show to what "calumny" the writer alludes, who were its publishers, or when he "solemnly contradicted it." As to the locality, it would possibly be precarious to direct a communication to a gentleman giving no fuller address.

On writing to the Map Department of the British Museum for information as to the whereabouts of "Rohic," I received a reply suggesting that I perhaps meant Rohitsch (Rogatec), a small market town in Styria, in Austria. But how about "*Rohic?*" It is not mentioned in my edition of Dr. Keith Johnston's Atlas and Geographical Indices, and I am unable, after the most careful search, to find a trace of any such place in the German Atlas of Von Sydow. Now, I do not, even after this, contend that it is impossible that any place bearing that name exists; I am willing to surmise that it may represent some purely local Sclavonic title, or, let us say, the phonetic equivalent for a word otherwise spelt. In like manner, I do not wish to suggest that a letter (such as is described) has not been received, or accurately transcribed, or that it has been quoted otherwise than in good faith. But it is not clear to the world in general where it was sent from, and the fact remains that it does not so much as specify clearly what it condemns, or what are meant by "the discourse," "this calumny," or "it."

Be it noted that Mr. Smith has given to the expression of his opinions on Anglican Orders the title, "*Rome's Witness against Anglican Orders*," and yet he tells his readers that "the judgment of the writers who have at various times composed treatises on the subject, theological and controversial, has and

claims to have, only private authority." How does Mr. Smith intend that we should differentiate between his opinion ("Rome's Witness") and the opposite opinion of numerous co-religionists? His method of dealing with certain authorities quoted by me is, to say the least, extraordinary. He asserts that their number "*consists mostly of persons of an eccentric temperament.*" The great and distinguished Bossuet, he thinks, "*missed the true point of the argument.*" Another writer, he concludes, "*was always much more of an Anglican than a Catholic*" (for of course it is to be remembered that Mr. Smith regards it as un-Catholic to defend Anglican Orders). Others again, he thinks, "*may not have been quite orthodox in the conception of what would be required to make 're-union' possible.*" Darboys he declares to have been "*misreported*" by an "Episcopalian Bishop" (*sic*), yet brings not one shred of proof to bear upon the assertion. I have not in the specified passage, however, claimed Archbishop Darboys (as represented by "Rome's Witness") as an authority on Anglican Orders. I have merely drawn attention to Bishop Cleveland-Coxe's record of his respect for the Church of England. It may be asked whether my opponent was ever personally acquainted with the Archbishop. Perhaps not. In such case I may be excused for declining to accept the suggestion that a prelate who knew him has told a falsehood. The learned Drs. Girardin and Du Pin, of the Sorbonne, Mr. Smith disposes of as "*heterodox*"; Dr. Le Courayer, he airily throws over as coming under the same category. De Maistre, he thinks I had "no business" to quote. De Maistre went so far as to describe the English Church as "very precious," and my opponent apparently holds very different views on the subject. I may mention, however, that I have nowhere (though so represented by "Rome's Witness") quoted De Maistre as an authority on Anglican Orders. I have merely mentioned the Count's language in connection with his interest in the subject of the English Church as a means to the Re-union of Christendom, and this anyone reading the introductory remarks on page 2 (second edition) of my little book may see for himself. In case, however, Mr. Smith should be desirous of further knowing the sentiments of De Maistre, it may be well to note that among his Letters is one (addressed to a Russian lady) in which he speaks as follows:

"Were it permitted to establish degrees of importance amongst things of Divine institution, I should place the hierarchy before dogma—to so great a degree is the former indispensable to the maintenance of the faith. One may cite in favour of this theory a splendid experience which for three centuries has been conspicuous in the eyes of all Europe: I mean the Anglican Church, which has preserved a dignity and weight, absolutely foreign to all other Reformed Churches, entirely because the English good sense has preserved the hierarchy."

There are many authorities quoted by me to whom Mr. Smith has not made so much as a passing reference by name. Among these may be counted prelates of high note. He merely says that *he* has found them "*in some respect or other to be wanting*," and thus, in wholesale fashion, passes over masses of names and facts. The expression "in some respect or other" may satisfy some of his readers; but on the other hand there is the probability that the majority, if unbiassed, will neither feel that this method of arguing is so conclusive as he may intend it to be, nor that he "succeeds in his task of exposing" what the [Roman] *Catholic News* is pleased to describe as "Mr. Butler's fallacies."

Opposition in certain Roman quarters has resulted not only in increasing the circulation of my little book, but in advancing nterest in the subject with which it deals. The cause which I have espoused is a sound one, and I can well afford to overlook the personalities indulged in by one or two of my opponents. I am, moreover, quite willing to believe in the honesty of their personal convictions, however much their methods of expression may occasionally seem inconsistent with the principles set forth in 1 Corinthians xiii., with regard to charity.

ROME'S TRIBUTE TO ANGLICAN ORDERS.

SECTION I.

The Catholic desire for the Re-union of Christendom.

Since the commencement of the great Catholic Revival in England, an increased sense among the Anglican Clergy of their true position and responsibilities appears to have been a main incentive to spirited action in defence of their Church and her sacramental ordinances. As is well known, one of the chief weapons in use against the English Church has been that by which, from time to time, certain members of the Roman Communion have endeavoured to strike at the root of her existence as a true part of the Church of Christ. We refer to the oft-reiterated statements of such persons, whether from ignorance of her past history or lack of charity, that the English Church can claim no succession of ministry from the holy Apostles and therefore has nought but spurious sacraments.

But one of the most hopeful tokens in our times of a more general approach to a Re-union of Catholic Christendom lies in the increase of that charity "which hopeth all things" now exhibited by many members of the different Episcopal communions toward one another. The godless bigotry of but comparatively few years ago has largely given place to better feelings. And markedly is this shown in the attitude assumed by many members of the Anglican and Roman communions toward one

another.* "Could there be anything," said the late Dr. Ullathorne, "more desirable than that the bridge should be lowered between the two great authorities which represented the religious organizations and thought in the country? After ages of dissension, the bridge, he was glad to observe, was being lowered, and people on either side were beginning to comprehend each other better."† The hateful spirit which rejoiced in such a term as "Papistry" (with an offensive connotation) as applicable to the Roman system is dying out; and, as kindness begets kindness, the ugly title "heretic" is but seldom given by Roman Catholics to English Churchmen. We even find that the opprobrious use of the term "Protestant" is less frequent than formerly. And from mutual courtesies we have passed, thank God, to more gentle-spirited and candid

---

* "The late Archbishop of Paris once told me he did not believe in anything but the Church of England. He could not become a Protestant, but he should confess to his God that he did not believe in the supremacy or infallibility of the Pope." Sermon by the Right Rev. Bishop Cleveland-Coxe in the American Church, Avenue de l'Alma, Paris, on June 25th, 1888, published in the *Church Times*, July 6th, 1888.

Dr. Benjamin Carier, a learned Roman Catholic, in a letter to King James (Harleian MSS., 3142), speaking of Roman Catholics and English Churchmen, deprecates their thinking "they are as far asunder as the horizons they do look upon," and he adds, "But, if it might please your Majesty to command them to turn but a quarter about, and look both one way, to the service of God and your Majesty, and to the salvation of souls, they should, presently, see themselves to be a great deal more near together, in matters of doctrine, than the puritanical preachers, on both sides, do make them believe they are."

The views of Monsieur Gondon were expressed in very similar terms: "When Anglicans and [Roman] Catholics shall be agreed as to the principles, when they shall understand *one another* on the points of doctrine, the Re-union will realise itself of itself; and if it is to be collective, the difficulties, which may now seem insurmountable, will resolve themselves by a logical sequence of the common understanding on the fundamental principles."—De la Réunion de l'Eglise Angleterre Protestante à l'Eglise Catholique. Avant Propos, p. ix.

† Speech of the Right Rev. Dr. Ullathorne, Roman Catholic Bishop of Birmingham, at Leamington, August, 1864. *Vide* Essays on the Re-union of Christendom (First series), p. iv.

The possibility of such charitable relations was ably illustrated by the attitude of Roman Catholics in the Diocese of Limerick toward Bishop Jebb (see *Appendix D*).

enquiry on either side into our true position and teachings.* The result has not led English Churchmen as a body to a conviction that they can yet enter into corporate communion with Rome, nor the present Pope to define that we are in possession of a true place in the Communion of God's Holy Church; but there are unquestionably many signs of the times which give hope of a closer approach to possibilities of a general Re-union of Christendom. "If ever Christians draw nearer to each other, as everything invites them," wrote the learned Ultramontane, Count Joseph De Maistre, in 1817, "it seems that the movement must start from the Church of England. We are too far off . . . but the Anglican Church, which touches us with one hand, touches with the other those whom we cannot touch."†

In 1857 Mr. Ambrose de Lisle wrote to the Cardinal Prefect of the Congregation *de Propagandâ Fide*, informing him that a scheme was entertained for the organic and corporate re-union of the two Churches. Cardinal Barnabo replied that the matter was the greatest consolation to him, that nothing could be more in harmony with his wishes, and whilst wishing every blessing to the scheme, promised to lay it before Pius IX.‡ On the Feast of the Nativity of the B.V.M. in the

---

* An English Priest, from whom the compiler has received signal help in his researches, writes, "You may like to know that the late Rev. F. John Bigg, Vicar of Stamfordham and Proctor for the Archdeaconry of Northumberland, a man of the highest character, was assured by an equally respected Roman Catholic Priest that 'English Orders were quite as valid as Roman, and that it was not creditable to the Roman authorities that they had not the honesty to own it.' Your treatise will show that some are more honest."

† Considerations sur la France I. C. ii., p. 27. "Si jamais les Chrétiens se rapprochent comme tout les y invite, il semble que la motion doit partir de l'Eglise de l'Angleterre. . . l'Eglise Anglicane qui nous touche d'une maine, touche de l'autre ceux qui nous ne pouvons toucher." And the Count goes on to speak affectionately of the English Church in the words, "elle est très precieuse."

‡ Essays on the Re-union of Christendom by Members of the Roman Catholic and Anglican Communions (First Series), pp. 233, 234, where Cardinal Barnabo's letter is given in full, countersigned by Cajetan, Archbishop of Thebes.

same year, a body of Roman Catholics, Greeks, and Anglicans met in the parish of St. Clement Danes, London, after having at their respective Altars asked God's blessing on their plan, which consisted in the formation of the "Association for Promoting the Unity of Christendom." The distinguished Roman Catholic who took the initiative was seconded and supported unanimously by members of the Anglican and Greek Communions. The Pope of Rome gave his blessing to the scheme, and afterwards repeated it with a kindly commendation to one of the English secretaries, to whom a special interview was granted. The Ex-Patriarch of Constantinople, and various other Prelates (Eastern, Roman, and Anglican), added expressions of their approval,* whilst on the published lists of the acting officials of the Association in 1864 appeared, in company with the names of the Anglican clergy, a goodly sprinkling of Roman ecclesiastical dignitaries.† The Rev. A. Saunders Dyer speaks of the Association as having had on its roll in 1868 no less than 1,881 Roman Catholic members in addition to those belonging to the Church of England, the Oriental and other communions.‡ It is said that this Society was condemned by a decree of the Inquisition in 1864. But, notwithstanding this, we find the Rev. A. H. Hore, in his "Church and No Church," published in 1873, reporting the Association as continuing to enlist Roman Catholic members of distinction.§ It sustains to this day its characteristic of combining members of the Catholic bodies in a league of prayer. The late Rev. Father Lockhart, of the Institute of Charity, took a marked interest in its work. He did not regard the prospects of re-union as vain. To quote his words, "Corporate Re-union *cannot be impossible*, since it has been realised by the Church at the Council of Florence, as well as in various other transactions with separate bodies . . . if the Church attempted it, *clearly the principle is sound.*"||

---

* *Ibid.* Preface, pp. x., xi., xii.

† *Ibid.* Appendix, p. 324—329.

‡ Sketches of English Nonconformity. By the Rev. A. Saunders Dyer, M.A., p. 25.

§ Church and No Church. By Rev. A. H. Hore, M.A., Chaplain to the Forces, etc., p. 195.

|| Possibilities and Difficulties of Re-union, pp. 5, 6.

The Church of England's possession of the Catholic heritage is a subject of increasing interest to the authorities of the ancient communions of the East. Arsenius, Metropolitan of Thebais, came to England in 1716, and from this visit originated negotiations which were carried on for several years between the Scottish and Nonjuring Bishops and the Eastern Patriarchs. A scheme was submitted by Arsenius to the Czar and approved by him, but unfortunately the Nonjurors raised difficulties. About the same time negotiations for Re-union were attempted by Barchmann Wuytiers, Archbishop of Utrecht, according to a plan suggested by the Sorbonne Faculty, but the proceedings were quashed by the infamous Cardinal Dubois, Archbishop of Cambrai. In the present day the probability which lies nearer to realisation seems to be that of intercommunion between the English and Eastern Churches.* The late Dr. Neale was amongst those who have been most successful in interesting the modern authorities of the Greek Communion in the policy and work of the Church of England.

It may be added that in 1866 a certain Dr. Overbeck stood forth as an enthusiastic champion of Eastern orthodoxy, and dealt with the whole question; but the tone which he adopted in his volume was so overbearing, that he could scarcely in fairness expect Anglicans to accept his leadership or his own particular proposals as to the terms of their intercommunion

---

* Many Eastern dignitaries have of late years used utterances indicative of their earnest desire for friendly relations and union between these Churches. Among them may be included the late Patriarch of Constantinople, the Patriarchs of Antioch and Jerusalem, the Metropolitans of Lemnos, Chios (Gregory of Byzantium), Cos, Cyzicus, two Metropolitans of Thessaly, and one in Illyria, the Bishops of Mount Tabor, Homs, Hamah, and Smyrna. (*Vide* Dr. Pusey's Introductory Essay, pp. xxxiv.—xxxvi., in Essays on the Re-union of Christendom.) Also see Appendix *A*. The Rev. C. A. Fowler, in an "Essay on Present Prospects of Re-union," records the case of an English priest admitted to Communion in the Church of Servia. Inter-communion with the English Church is, moreover, greatly desired by the Old Catholics, but, as Bishop Reinkins writes to the Rev. M. R. Butler, "Zur vollen Intercommunion sind für die Altkatholiken die 39 Artikel noch sehr im Wege." (See Appendix *B*.)

with the Church of his adoption.* However, when bonds have been eventually cemented with our Eastern brethren, the Roman Church may herself be drawn to offer acceptable terms for a yet more extended and glorious union.† "The doctrine of Augustine," wrote the eloquent Oratorian Père Gratry, in 1870‡ to the Archbishop of Malines, "is the doctrine of Bossuet. He speaks ever of the authority and consent of the universal Church. . . But how comes it that a German theologian should have made S. Augustine speak of the Roman Church alone what he spoke of the Church universal, the Church at large? Or why should he in a quotation from S. Ambrose have substituted the words 'Roman Church' for the word Italy. . . Our treasure is Christ, His Gospel, the Sacraments He has left us, and the promise of eternal life. Fear not then; seek this life eternal: you all know the way. In every humble village of every Christian land the priests of Jesus hold the keys of the Church, into which you may enter, and there lean as the beloved Apostle on Jesus' breast. . . To-day the dependents of one of the Apostles say, he is all, the other Apostles are nothing. But rest assured this trial, as others, will turn out for good. Men will

---

* Catholic Orthodoxy and Anglo-Catholicism: A word about Intercommunion between the English and the Orthodox Churches. By J. J. Overbeck, D.D.

† The Dominican, Chéry, contends that in all controverted points, the Roman Church leaves men the power of coming to their own conviction, and demands the submission of their minds "only on the questions which have received the sanction of the universal Church." He adds, "Such in two words is the charta which she will publish, on the day when England and Russia shall think seriously of Re-union with her, absolute faith in all the dogmatic points decreed by the Holy Councils and received by the universal Church, liberty on all other questions." (Chéry, Appel à l'Eglise Russe et à l'Eglise Anglicane) The words quoted are all the more remarkable owing to the fact that the work in which they occur consists for the most part of a violent diatribe. Like Dr. Overbeck above mentioned, Chéry realized the importance of a re-union of the Churches, but lacked the spirit of charity which should characterise any dealing with such a subject.

‡ Second Letter to the Archbishop of Malines. Published in Vol. viii. of "Church Work," pp. 115, 116.

A translation of this Father's Letters has been separately published by the Rev. T. Bailey, under the title "Père Gratry on Papal Infallibility."

come from the East and North; and long-parted brethren will with us seek a new West. Learning and sound criticism will purify the corrupted vessel; the treasure will remain."

It is interesting to note that the late Bishop of Lincoln wrote to Archbishop Tait stating that he had received a communication from Rome that some of the Bishops at the Vatican Council, who apprehended evil results from the promulgation of the Dogma of the personal infallibility of the Bishop of Rome, would be very thankful for the moral support of the Anglican Episcopate.*

---

* Letter dated 8th June, 1870. See Life of Archbishap Tait, Vol. ii., p. 76.
Père Gratry was strongly opposed to the Dogma.

SECTION II.

Anglican Orders and the Council of Trent.

It is well worthy of remark that the Roman Church has never publicly and authoritatively defined that Anglican Orders are invalid. Opportunity was afforded when the subject of the character and position of the Anglican Episcopate was brought before the Fathers assembled in the Council of Trent, but no decision upon it was arrived at. As a matter of fact it is alleged that they distinctly refused to pronounce the English Bishops to be no Bishops. We may add that any directly adverse pronouncement would have been impossible, owing to the ridiculous position in which it would have placed the then reigning Pope, Pius IV. He had invited the English Prelates, *as Bishops*, to join in the deliberations of the Council. In 1561 he sent a Nuncio to Queen Elizabeth "to notify, that the Council of Trent which had been interrupted would be continued in the same place, and to desire her to send thither some English Bishops. The Abbot Martinengo, who was charged with the commission, arrived in Flanders, and sending for leave to pursue his journey into England could never obtain it."* The Pope had dispatched him "with Letters of a very smooth contents," informing Her Majesty that if she would be pleased to send Bishops to the Council, "he did not question giving them such satisfaction as might open a way to a farther accommodation." Divers opinions were held as to the wisdom of the Pope's action in sending the Nuncio. Those who approved, suggested that His Holiness "was by no means of so rugged a temper as his predecessor," that it was "apparent the Repose of Christendom lay strongly at his heart," and that "the refusing

* History of England. By Rapin de Thoyras. Translated into English by N. Tindale, M.A. (second edition, 1733), Vol. II., Book xvii., 23.

him an audience would disoblige the Princes of the Roman Communion." However, the papal efforts to secure a contingent of English Bishops at the Council continued. The Nuncio Martinengo being refused to come into England, the Bishop of Viterbo, Nuncio at Paris, solicited Throgmorton to persuade Queen Elizabeth to change her mind. "She was likewise importuned by several Princes and Great Men; by the Kings of France and Spain, the King and Cardinal of Portugal, and more especially by the Duke of Alva, to rely upon so solemn a Representation of the Bishops of Christendom." The Queen's answer was, "That though she heartily desired a General Council, she would send no Body to Trent; . . . . that it was not the Pope's but the Emperor's privilege to call a Council: and that she did not understand that Prelate had any advantage of authority above another Bishop."* A remonstrance was then addressed, through Seignior Scipio, of Padua (a gentleman in the public service of the Venetian State) to Dr. Jewell, Bishop of Salisbury, expressing amazement that the English Bishops did not even send a letter "to excuse their absence" when "summoned by the Vicegerent of Christ, for the settlement of religion." (Bishop Jewel sent an elaborate reply.)†

This act of "recusancy," indeed, was bitterly resented by the whole Pontifical hierarchy. The English Bishops were loudly declared to be contumacious for not attending the celebrated Synod.‡ Dorman, writing to Dean Nowell, with wild invective and raillery declared that they were kept at

---

* An Ecclesiastical History of Great Britain, chiefly of England: from the first planting of Christianity in this Island, with a Brief Account of the Affairs of Religion in Ireland. Collected from the best Ancient Historians, Councils and Records. By Jeremy Collier, M.A. London, 1714. Vol. II., Bk. vi., pp. 474, 475.

Mr. Collier also gives a marginal reference to Heylin's record of the circumstances. See also Sarpi, Istoria di Concilio, etc. V. 61. (First published in 1617.)

† An Epistle written by the Reverend Father in God, John Jewel, D.D., in answer to a letter of Seigneur Scipio. (Bound up with a small edition of Jewel's Apology in the possession of Rev. M. R. Butler.) P. 163.

‡ Life of Bishop Jewel. By Rev. Charles Webb Le Bas, M.A. Ch. v., pp. 113—117.

home by their wives.* Dean Nowell replied to Dorman, alas, in a tone which showed that he was his match in offensiveness. At this Council, it is true, the Irish Bishop, O'Harte, of Achonry, asserted that on the score of not being appointed by the Pope the English Prelates were no true Bishops; but he added, "We refute them by this reason only, for they *show that they were called, elected, consecrated, and given mission.*"† The Spanish Bishops present, led by the Bishop of Cadiz, urged that papal confirmation of an Episcopate is unnecessary, thereby rejecting the only objection raised by the Irish Prelate aforementioned‡.

---

* Strype's Annals. Vol. I., Part ii., pp. 58, 59.

† Anglican Orders and Jurisdiction. By Rev. C. H. V. Pixell, M.A., p. 3. Also see Le Plat., Monument. Concil., Trident., V., 576—579.

‡ *N.B.*—Any other conclusion than that of these Spanish Bishops would imply a denial of the validity of Greek Episcopates quite as much as of those of the English Church. (See Appendix *C.*)

SECTION III.

Action of various Popes in relation to the Anglican Succession.

"As to its [the Church of England's] possession of an Episcopal Succession from the time of the Apostles, well, it may have it, and if the Holy See ever so decided, I will believe it, as being the decision of a higher judgment than my own." Such was the equivocal language of the late Dr. Newman in the Appendix to his "Apologia." In 1833 he had spoken with burning affirmative earnestness on the subject,* but here we find an uncertain ring in his utterances. He does not state, be it seen, that he was, of necessity, ready to believe what even certain occupants of the papal throne have personally *held* or *allowed* to be truth, but apparently would allow his belief its full exercise only "if the Holy See has so *decided*." He adds that he cannot "by his own wit acquiesce" in the view that Anglican Orders are valid; but at the same time ignores that they were in some true sense acquiesced in by the wit of Popes Julius III., Paul IV., Pius IV., Urban VIII., and Innocent XII. It would be preposterous to suppose that such a mind as that of Dr. Newman would sink to the stupidity of trying *to believe* that which he was entirely convinced was false, however far obedience to a superior might enforce silence as to the character of a conviction. On any hypothesis, the words which have been quoted convey the strong impression that Dr. Newman, after his secession, really suspected that to be true, in regard to Anglican Ordinations, which he had received no personal sanction to admit.

The investigation into the subject of papal recognition of the Orders of the English Church is one which furnishes interesting results, and it is strange that certain well-established facts of

---

* The Oxford Movement, by R. W. Church, M.A., D.C.L., Ch. vi., pp. 112—118.

history, having a direct bearing on the subject, have received but scant attention in connection with the controversy. In their cumulative character they are of unquestionable weight.

One of the most interesting illustrations of papal acquiescence in Anglican Orders is the following. On the 8th March, 1554, Pope Julius III. sent a Brief to Cardinal Pole, Archbishop of Canterbury,* desiring him to absolve and reconcile Bishops and Priests made in Edward Sixth's time; but instead of telling him that they were to be re-ordained, His Holiness commanded the Cardinal to confirm them in the Anglican Orders which they had already received, and to re-instate them, "after by you they shall have been restored to the unity of Holy Mother Church, and you shall have thought good to re-instate them, if in other respects they shall be accounted by you to be worthy and fit." The Pope further specified that those who had received the Anglican consecration should be regarded as having had the "gift of consecration already bestowed." The Brief goes on to say that the Archbishops and Bishops may enter anew on the government of their Churches and perform all episcopal acts, such as consecration, ordination, etc. :—

"Other Cathedrals, even over Metropolitan Churches, as Bishops and Archbishops, they may freely and legally preside, and may rule and govern the same Church both in things spiritual as well as temporal, and use the gifts of consecration already bestowed upon them . . .; and to any, even sacred and priestly Orders advance, and in the same, or Orders by them already, though irregularly received, even in the Ministry of the Altar serve, and the gift of consecration receive, and the same freely and lawfully dispense, we grant you by these presents full and free Apostolic authority, permission, and power."

Dr. Nicholas Sander testifies that the Anglican Episcopal Orders, which were officially recognised and confirmed under papal authority by Cardinal Pole, received additional recognition from another occupant of the Holy See, for they were "established and confirmed afterwards by the letters of Pope Paul IV."† It is also worthy of note that this Pontiff

---

* Brief of Pope Julius III. to Cardinal Pole, A.D. 1554. *Vide* Bailey. Defensio Ordinum Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ, p. 69.

† *Vide* De Schismate Anglicano, Lib. ii., p. 350, Sander.

offered to confirm the English Book of Common Prayer. An important part of the said Book was the Ordinal of the Church of England, which had in its preface the statement that she had retained the Apostolic Succession, and that she took pains to ensure within her pale that Holy Orders "should be continued, and reverently used and esteemed." The offer of His Holiness to sanction and authorize the whole book was therefore a direct acknowledgment of the validity of Anglican Orders. The condition which he made to Queen Elizabeth was that she should, in such case, acknowledge his authority, and the Reformation as derivative from him.

Clear evidence has also been produced that Pope **Pius IV.** (like his predecessor) offered to acknowledge and sanction the Book of Common Prayer on condition that the English nation made final appeal to the Holy See on questions of doctrine.* "Lord Coke, in his charge at the Norwich Assizes, August 4, 1604," writes Dr. Littledale,† "stated that he had often heard from Queen Elizabeth that Pius IV. had offered to accept the Book of Common Prayer; and that he had also frequently conferred with noblemen of the highest rank in the

---

St. Alphonsus M. Liguori frankly records the same fact, and speaks of the Prelates, whose Orders were thus recognised, as "Catholic Bishops though installed in the time of the schism." See History of Heresies and their Refutation, &c., &c., Translated from the Italian of St. Alphonsus M. Liguori. By the Right Rev. Dr. Mullock, Bishop of Newfoundland. 1857. Pp. 343, 344.

* *Vide* Pope Pius IV. and the Book of Common Prayer. By E. C. Harington, M.A.

† Plain Reasons against joining the Church of Rome. By Richard Frederick Littledale, LL.D., D.C.L., p. 212. *Note.*

Efforts have been made by certain persons to deprive this statement of fact by Coke of any value, by saying that he afterwards denied it. The sole ground of this strange allegation appears to be the following admission of Coke that his charge was deficient in legal accuracy and style, *i.e.*, "The charge contained gross errors and absurdities in laws; the style was rude and rugged, and far from a lawyer's dialect." Such a general statement about the legal character and style of a long assize charge can scarcely in fairness be made to serve as a denial of a particular reference therein to Queen Elizabeth's relations with the Pope. As to the accuracy of Coke's statement of the simple fact, the witness of Walsingham is, moreover, confirmatory.

State, who had seen and read the Pope's letter." The *Guardian* for May 31, 1893, contains particulars of additional and indisputable evidence of this official offer of Pius IV. "In the *Calendar of State Papers*, at the Record Office (Foreign, Eliz., May—June, 1571, vol. cxviii., p. 138) there is a despatch from Walsingham to Burghley, dated Louviers, June 21st, 1571. The despatch, which is long, was written at a time when negotiations were taking place in view of the projected marriage between Elizabeth and the Duke of Anjou. In it Walsingham gives an outline of a conversation between himself and the Queen-mother, Catherine de Medicis, in which he had endeavoured to remove existing scruples to the use of the English Liturgy by the Duke. Here is the crucial passage :— 'I showed her that sudden change was not required (the same being referred over to God whose office it is to change hearts), but only the forbearing of his Mass, and to content himself with the form of our prayers, whereof I showed her I had delivered a copy unto Mons. de Foix, which form of prayers, madam, quoth I, the Pope, as I am informed, would have by councell confirmed as Catholic so the Q. my mistress would have acknowledged the same as received from him.' In the margin on the left hand, opposite the last thirteen words, is the following note :—An offer made by ye C. of Loreyne as Sr. N. Throgmorton shewed me. The signature and note are in Walsingham's own precise and characteristic handwriting. And if it be remembered that the Cardinal of Lorraine was the papal Legate in France, and consequently in communication with the Bishop of Viterbo, the papal Ambassador, the importance of Walsingham's note can hardly be exaggerated."

After the accession of Elizabeth, those who were afterwards known as Roman Catholics attended (with papal connivance, if not permission) the services of the English Church and received the Sacraments at the hands of her priesthood. No doubt was expressed as to the validity of Anglican ministrations until the English Church had persistently declined to acknowledge the dogma of papal supremacy; and the mandate of Pius V. went forth in 1570 calling on Catholics to break with their Church in England and form new conventicles

subject to the Church of Italy.* This was done in spite of the fact (which Bishop Jeremy Taylor records in one of his Letters) that those who were called upon to secede from the Church accounted the prayers "good and holy." It is also worthy of remark that at the Visitation of 1559, although there were 10,000 clergy, only the small number of 180 refused to accept the reformed offices. The Rev. J. J. Blunt, in his "Sketch of the Reformation in England" (page 304) even sets down the number of malcontent clergy at only *eighty*, and quotes as his authority Strype's Annals, page 73. John Fisher, Bishop of Rochester, took the oath of supremacy of the Crown,† and in all probability also Pole.‡ "From the first year of Elizabeth unto the eleventh," said Sir Edward Coke, Attorney-General (in the trial of the conspirators in the Gunpowder Plot), "all Papists came to our Church and service without scruple. I myself have seen Cornwallis, Bedingfield, and others; so that then, for the space of ten years, they made no conscience nor doubt to communicate with us in prayer."§

---

* *Vide* A Compendious Ecclesiastical History. By the Rev. William Palmer, M.A., of Worcester Coll., Oxford, pp. 257, 258; A Key to the Knowledge of Church History (*Modern*). Edited by John Henry Blunt, M.A., etc., Sec. 13, pp. 44, 45; and a History of the Church from the Great Schism to the present time. By C. A. Jones, etc., Vol. II., pp. 193—201.

Also see Mr. Bennett's series of Articles in "The Old Church Porch," and, in particular, Vol. IV., No. xxvi. p. 407, where he says, "This most remarkable fact may be added, namely, that this *identity of Communion was for a long period recognised by Rome herself.* Even after the Papal Supremacy was denied in Henry VIII.'s time, and all through the reign of Edward, and so far as the eleventh year of Queen Elizabeth, A.D., 1570, there was no interruption of communion between those who adhered to the Reformation, and those who did not. All, both those of Rome and those of England, although they differed in opinion, still communicated together. It was only at that late date that the Pope by excommunicating Queen Elizabeth placed the Kingdom of England out of communion with Rome."

† *Vide* History of Heresies, and their Refutation, etc., etc. Translated from the Italian of St. Alphonsus M. Ligouri. Ch. XII., Sec. 1, 8, pp. 333, 334.

‡ *Vide* Our Established Church, p. 442, *Footnote*, Hardwicke, *Ref* p. 192.

§ Howell's State Trials, 178.

It is, of course, inconceivable that Julius III. should have solemnly reinstated Anglican Prelates, or that Paul IV. and Pius IV. should have expressed willingness to authorize and confirm the Book of Common Prayer, unless these occupants of the Holy See held that English Orders had a positive value. And evidence exists that a conviction on the same subject possessed the mind of Pope Urban VIII. That he not only appreciated the high character of Archbishop Laud, but also admitted the authority of that Anglican Prelate to exercise the sacred functions of episcopacy, is shown by the fact that the papal offer of the Cardinal's hat was twice made to Laud—once on the very morning his predecessor died, and again on his own accession to the Primacy in 1633. (The same offer is said to have been made to Bishop Williams in 1622.) Laud replied (Diary, page 49) that "something dwelled within him which would not suffer that, till Rome was otherwise than it was at the present time."* The circumstance is referred to by the Roman Catholic historian, Lingard.

In passing, in may be worth mentioning that Pope Innocent XI., who acceded to the Papacy in 1676, gave his full sanction to the efforts of Cardinal Royas de Spinola to promote the interests of Re-union, important concessions being made on the Roman side.† This movement was, however, one which

---

* *Vide* Life of Archbishop Laud. By Charles Webb Le Bass, M.A., Professor in the East India College, Herts, etc., Ch. ix., pp. 371—373; also a History of the English Church from the Accession of Henry VIII. to the silencing of Convocation in the eighteenth century. By G. G. Perry, M.A., Canon of Lincoln, etc., Ch. xxvi., Sec. 18, p. 424; and English Church History, etc. By C. M. Yonge, p. 148.

C. A. Jones makes mention of negotiations carried on with Urban VIII. with reference to the question of a proposed Re-union between the two Churches. (See History of the Church from the great schism to the present time. By C. A. Jones, etc., with Preface by R. F. Littledale, LL.D., Vol. II., p. 203.) Dr. Karl August Hase, the German historian, in his Kirchengeschichte, p. 478, goes so far as to say that this Pope's policy for a considerable time was to lend himself to *Protestant* influences, and thereby gave grief to Catholics; but there seems but slender authority for this statement.

† *Vide* An Eirenicon of the Eighteenth Century, etc., edited by Henry Nutcombe Oxenham, M.A. Introduction, pp. 28, 29.

apparently more nearly concerned the Germans than the English, and the desired end in this case would have been more difficult of accomplishment owing to the fact that the Lutherans had rejected episcopacy. Ineffectual attempts were made more than once to get England to supply the defect.

Yet one more interesting case of papal recognition of Anglican Orders may be cited. In 1693 King James II., having decided to consult well-known French divines on the subject of perpetuating the Anglican succession, laid the case before Monsignor Harlay (Archbishop of Paris) and Monsignor Bossuet (Bishop of Meaux), who after giving careful consideration to the matter, referred it to the judgment of the Holy See. Pope Innocent XII. defined that the King was bound to maintain and defend the succession as long as the laws of the kingdom, under which the Anglican Church was established, were in force. Had His Holiness held the English Episcopate and priesthood to be invalid or sacrilegious, this judgment would, of course, have been impossible.

Pope Clement XIV. (1769) heartily desired, and personally laboured to bring about, a union between the two Churches.

SECTION IV.

The attitude of many Roman Catholic Prelates in respect to the subject.

Passing from the testimony of Popes to that of Cardinals, we may fairly cite Cardinal Reginald Pole, Archbishop of Canterbury, as on the side of those who have acknowledged Anglican Orders. Acting under papal authority, to which we have already referred, he *confirmed* "the gift of consecration already bestowed" in the case of English Prelates. His own document contained the following words:—"*Quodque, irregularitate et aliis præmissis non obstantibus, in suis Ordinibus etiam ab hæreticis et schismaticis Episcopis, etiam minus rite, dummodo in eorum collatione Ecclesiastica forma et intentio sit servata per eos susceptis . . . etiam in Altaris Ministerio ministrare . . . valeant.** The document bore the date January 8th, 1555, and the fact which it establishes is borne out by concurrent testimony of the Roman Catholic historian, Sander. He says that the Cardinal "confirmed all Bishops made in the previous schism so they were Catholic in their religion."† It would be absurd to conjecture that Pole did not believe the Ordinations, which he so confirmed, to be real. Cardinal Pole died November 25th, 1558.

At a far later age we find the celebrated Jesuit, Cardinal

---

* *Vide* Memorials of Cranmer. Appendix, p. 188. Rev. S. F. Smith S.J., in the *Month*, July, 1893, contends that these words clearly *exclude* Orders conferred by the Edwardine Ordinal. The language of Julius III. to Cardinal Pole, however, shows this to be a mistake. The Bull makes a direct reference to Bishops or Archbishops who, under "King Henry and Edward his son," had received the administration of Cathedral Churches. Moreover, the Edwardine Ordinal preserved the essentials of Catholic Ordination.

† On this point see The Roman Question. By Rev. T. T. Carter, M.A., pp. 78, 79; also Apostolical Succession in the Church of England. By Rev. Arthur W. Haddan, M.A., pp. 240, 241.

Archbishop Odescalchi, S.J.,* brought to a conviction as to the soundness of English Ordinations by the arguments put forward by the Rev. Sir H. Trelawney, and by reading a treatise penned by the Provost of Trinity College, Dublin. The Cardinal declared that he "had no idea that there was so much to be adduced in favour of the Orders of the Anglican Church, and that he could quite understand Sir Harry's strong feeling on the subject." Not satisfied, however, with this expression of opinion, he took pains to urge upon the Sacred College the importance and wisdom of giving their full consideration to the facts of the case; but unfortunately they appear to have shelved the whole question.

It is interesting to note that Cardinal Barberini declared that "nothing would be more agreeable to him" than an union between the English and Roman Churches; and direct overtures were made on the subject with the concurrence of Cardinal De Nouailles in 1717; whilst in our own times we find even Cardinal Wiseman allowing that there were possibilities of reconciling the Tridentine doctrinal decisions with the Anglican Articles.† Before the election of the last-mentioned prelate to the cardinalate he had written a letter to Lord Shrewsbury in the interests of Re-union.

In the Preface to a work by Cardinal de la Luzerne,‡ a late Archbishop of Paris wrote: "L'Eglise Anglicane fut la seule des sectes Protestantes qui conserva son Episcopat."

Of other Roman Prelates there appears to have been many who held the same view respecting English Orders as the dignitaries already mentioned.

We may instance the following:—

Bishop Bonner (made Bishop of London, 1539).—The Roman Catholic historian, Lingard, speaks of Bishop Bonner as having admitted that the consecration of Archbishop Parker

---

* *Vide* Validity of the Holy Orders of the Church of England. By Rev. F. G. Lee, D.C.L., F.S.A., Ch. xxvi., Sec. 3, p. 304.

† An Eirenicon of the Eighteenth Century. Edited, with Introduction, by H. N. Oxenham, M.A., p. 43, *footnote*, and p. 69. See also Catholic Unity, pp. 40—42, London, 1841.

‡ Sur les Droits des Eveques.

(through whom we trace the English Succession) took place, and that it was performed "by Bishops who had been restored after their deposition."* It is true that Bonner regarded Anglican Orders as "schismatical" (as Greek Orders are also held by the Roman Church), but he still regarded them as valid. He allowed that Anglican priests could say Mass, but desired that they should be "reconciled" and "admitted by the Ordinary" before they were permitted to continue the exercise of this function.† It has been sometimes alleged by opponents of Anglican Orders that Scory was the sole consecrator of Parker and others, but that he was himself consecrated by the first man on whom he laid hands. A refutation of this is, however, furnished by Bishop Bonner, who describes Scory as "Our beloved brother John, lately Bishop of Chichester." This expression, moreover, establishes that the Edwardine rite (under which Scory was consecrated) was, on Roman authority, good and valid.‡

Monsignor De Dominis (Archbishop of Spalato and Primate of Dalmatia and Croatia) in 1620 wrote, in answer to Suarez:—

"Urget defectum Pastorum in Ecclesia Anglicana, unde Catholica esse non possit, sed id imperite quidem: non caret illa necessariis ministris etiam Episcopis et legitime ordinatis per veram ab Apostolis successionem; Episcopi enim Romani Catholici ordinarunt aliquos Episcopos qui in reformatione permanserunt, et illi alios Successive, ut ex ipsorum Archivis indubitatis constat: et sic legitima facta est ministrorum propagatio . . . . . ministri enim rite et legitime ibi ordinati, habent verbi et sacramentorium ministrationem eandem prorsus, quam Apostoli habuerunt."§

A special interest attaches to the testimony of Archbishop Antonio De Dominis, as he had already given practical proof of his belief in the organization of the English Church by

---

* Letter in Catholic Magazine, Birmingham, Vol. V., 1834.

† Articles of visitation by Bishop Bonner, A.D. 1554. Article xxix. of the 1st series. Cardwell's Documentary Annals, Vol. i, p. 144,

‡ *Vide* Bonner's Register, Folio 347, July 14, 1554.

§ Ostentio Errorum P. Francisci Suarez per M. Antonium de Dominis, Archiepiscopum Spalatensem. Londoni, Anno 1620.

acting as one of the consecrators of both George Monteigne, Bishop of London, and Nicholas Felton, Bishop of Ely, at Lambeth on December 14, 1617.

Monsignor Jacques Benigne Bossuet (Bishop o Meaux, 1670—1688). The Very Rev. Père Fr. de Riberolles, sometime Abbot of St. Genevieve and Superior General of the Canons Regular of the Congregation of France, certified by a declaration that he frequently heard this Prelate say that "if the Episcopal succession in England under the Government of Cromwell was well proved, which he had not sufficiently examined, there was no difficulty about the validity of the English ordinations, and that their Bishops and Priests were as truly ordained as ours." The date of the Certificate was May 20, 1726. Père Caldaguez afterwards declared that Bishop Bossuet had no doubts about the succession in Cromwell's time, all his difficulties having been entirely cleared up. To Père Marcella, Curé of S. Jacques du Haut-Pas in Paris, Bishop Bossuet stated in 1699 that if the English clergy would submit to Rome they would only require to be "reconciled" and "rehabilitated." The fact is, that to the last the good Bishop admitted the English claim to the succession, and wrote in 1685 to his particular friend Père Jean Mabillon, O.S.B., of the Abbaye de Saint Germain des Prés in Paris (a celebrated liturgiologist, who was then in Rome), that he "had no difficulty about the ordinations made in the time of Edward and Elizabeth, notwithstanding the pretended suppression of the Sacrifice and Priesthood among the English."* Père Courayer also testifies that Bishop Bossuet "was much inclined to this side" [*i.e.*, the Anglican], and quotes the following words of this Prelate :—

"It is contended that the succession of the Ordination was interrupted. The English maintain the contrary; and as to the succession at the beginning of the schism, they maintain that there is no difficulty; and in this they seem to be in the right."†

---

* *Vide* Succession of Bishops in the Church of England unbroken. By E. C. Harrington, M.A., pp. 3—6.

† A Dissertation on the Validity of the Orders of the English, and of the succession of the Bishops of the Anglican Church, etc. By P. F. Le Courayer. Editor's Introduction, p. xxxv., Ed. 1844. Also

Bossuet personally did what he could, by such works as his *Exposition of the Catholic Faith*, and by his joining with the French Bishops in thanking Bishop Bull for his Defence of the Nicene Creed, to promote a spirit of reconciliation and of friendly feeling towards the English Church.*

Monsignor Harlay (Archbishop of Paris, 1693). Passing allusion has already been made to this Prelate as referring the subject under discussion to the Holy See. Having done so, he and Bossuet published a decision, approved at Rome, as to the advisability of preserving the organization of the English Church. This neither of them could have done if any doubt existed in their own minds as so the genuineness of her Episcopate or Priesthood.†

---

see Author's Appendix. Article 1. Letter from the late M. J. Ben. Bossuet, Bishop of Meaux to Dom John Mabillon: dated *Germigny*, Aug. 12, 1685.

* Dr. Liddon's Preface to the English Translation of Professor Reusch's Report of the Re-union Conference at Bonn, 1874, pp. x.—xiv.

† *Vide* Dr. Lee's Validity of the Holy Orders of the Church of England, pp. 274—275.

SECTION V.

The same subject continued.

St. Alphonsus M. Liguori (Bishop of Agatha, Founder of the Congregation of the Most Holy Redeemer). The testimony of this learned Divine and Saint of the Roman Church has much value in relation to the subject under consideration, inasmuch as he candidly admits certain facts to which we have already referred, and speaks of the prelates, occupying sees by virtue of the orders conferred in Edward the Sixth's reign, as "Catholic Bishops." It is noteworthy that he makes such admissions in the course of an attack of some virulence upon the English Church, and does not even hint at any re-ordination :—

"Mary, likewise, proclaimed the innocence of Cardinal Pole, and requested Julius III. to send him to England at his Legate *a latere*. He arrived soon after, and, at the request of the Queen, reconciled the kingdom again to the Church, and absolved it from schism on the Vigil of St. Andrew, 1554; . . . *confirmed in their sees the Catholic bishops, though installed in the time of the schism*, and *recognised the new sees established by Henry. All this was subsequently confirmed by Paul IV.*"*

In Section IV. of the same chapter from which this quotation is given, although Liguori continues his attack on the English Church (in the reign of Elizabeth), he makes no mention of the Nag's Head Story, or of any spurious consecration or ordination, but throughout speaks of the Anglican Prelates simply as "Bishops."

Bishop Strickland, D.D. (Bishop of Namur). This Bishop is described by Dr. F. G. Lee as "a well-known Roman

* The History of Heresies and their Refutation; or, the Triumph of the Church. Translated from the Italian of St. Alphonsus M. Liguori, by the Right Rev. Dr. Mullock, Bishop of Newfoundland (second edition, Dublin, 1857). Ch. xii., Sec. iii., pp. 343–344.

Catholic Prelate, accused in his lifetime of Jansenism, but revered greatly after his death for his love of truth, charity, and moderation. He died Bishop of Namur."* Bishop Strickland made an enquiry into the question of Anglican Orders, and, having done so, maintained both their validity and regularity.

Bishop Henry Stonor (Vicar Apostolic in England). "Bishop Stonor, who was one of those who held the sufficiency of the Ordination formularies of the Prayer Book of the Established Church, maintained in print that, as far as he had enquired, he was willing to believe that the Church of England Ordinations were sufficient and valid."† He died, according to the Roman Directory, on March 29, 1756.

Monsignor Colbert (Bishop of Montpellier) furnished testimony to the same subject in the Catechism published by his authority for the use of the clergy of his diocese (1701, Part 1, Sec. ii., Ch. iii., Sec. 7, p. 297, Ed. 1795), as follows:

"*Demande.* Vous ne pouvez pas nier au moins que la Succession Apostolique ne convienne à plusieurs Evêques de l'Eglise qu'on nomme Anglicane, même depuis qu'ils se sont séparés de la communion de l'Eglise Romaine. *Réponse.* Je conviens qu'il peut y avoir quelques-uns de ces Evêques qui aient cette succession."‡

Bishop John Milner, D.D., F.S.A. (Bishop of Castabala, 1803—1826) is also counted among those who held the same view. He wrote:§

"She [the Anglican Church] teaches that the Orders of her ministers have descended from the Apostles and are appointed by God; and that the power given to them in the ceremony of Ordination is divine and essentially necessary to her existence."

"*The Order of the Priesthood is conferred* in the following words of Scripture, *agreeably to the Roman Pontifical*, 'Receive the Holy Ghost,'" etc.

---

* *Vide* Validity of the Holy Orders of the Church of England, p. 276.

† Quoted by Dr. F. G. Lee from a Roman Catholic Magazine.

‡ *Vide* Theophilus Anglicanus; or, Instruction for the Young Student concerning the Church and the Anglican Branch of it. By Christopher Wordsworth, D.D. (Bishop of Lincoln), p. 189 (fourteenth edition, 1886).

§ Letters to a Prebendary, 1843, p. 320, and *Note*.

In defending the Church of England against the charge of insidious and latitudinarian principles, Bishop Milner made use of the following remarkable expressions respecting his opponents: "If they will not be good Roman Catholics I am desirous that they should remain good Church of England men, being convinced that thereby the sacred code of Revelation will be much less violated, and the public peace and happiness much more *effectually secured.*"* This Prelate died on April 19, 1826.

Bishop James Doyle, D.D. (Bishop of Kildare and Leighlin), who to the day of his death appears to have cherished a strong affection for the Church of England,† declared in 1824:—

"This union [*i.e.* between the Churches of Rome and England] is not so difficult as it appears to many."

And he goes on to express the opinion that the points of difference are "apparently not the most important" and the failure in union has been "owing more to princes than priests; more to state policy than a difference of belief."‡

His sentiments are expressed at great length in an exceedingly charitable letter on the "Union of the Churches," addressed to Mr. Robinson, Chancellor of the Exchequer (afterwards Earl of Ripon, 1833) under date May 13, 1824, and published in the *Dublin Evening Post* of May 22. According to the Roman Catholic writer, Oxenham, "there is good reason to believe that he did not come forward

---

* Letter to His Eminence Cardinal Wiseman by Mr. A. Welby Pugin (February, 1851), wherein these words are quoted.

† *Vide* An Unexpected Disclosure of the last days of the celebrated Dr. Doyle, etc. (E. C. Alden.)

"Bishop Doyle stated, in remarkable language, what he conceived would be the result of an union between the Romish and English Churches, viz., "to heal the schism which separates England from the source and centre of unity, and, that once effected, *our idolatry* and *her heresy* would shortly disappear."—*Vide* An Eirenicon of the Eighteenth Century. Proposal for Catholic Communion. Edited by H. N. Oxenham, M.A., p. 43, Introduction.

‡ Catholic Miscellany, 1824, p. 234. Quoted by Dr. Pusey at pp. 17—18 of his Eirenicon.

without the tacit concurrence at least of the Holy See, and the result proved that he was far from speaking for himself alone."

In the following year he made the following open declaration before a Committee of the House of Lords :—

"As a Christian Church *possessing a Hierarchy* and preaching the doctrines of the Gospel, *I respect it* [the Church of England] *and esteem it* more than any other Church in the Universe, separated from the see of Rome."

In 1815 the Rev. P. Golightly, a Roman Catholic Priest in London, reprinted a long extract of a Charge by Dr. Shute Barrington (Anglican Bishop of Durham) in the interests of Re-union. Of this Prelate, Bishop Doyle wrote that, when dying, he could depart with the "rapturous language of good old Simeon." He added, "May the Saviour who has left us in the record of His Gospel, His own anxious prayer for the Union of His disciples, promote and prosper the blessed work of Catholic Union."*

Bishop Peter Baines, D.D., O.S.B. (a Vicar Apostolic in England) is cited by Dr. F. G. Lee as well known by many who were personally acquainted with him to have held the opinion that Anglican Orders are valid.† He died on August 6, 1882.‡

Archbishop Murray, D.D. (Archbishop of Dublin), in a letter§ to the Bishop of Gloucester, in 1839, writes as follows —

"A Church, like the Established Church of England, *which, having preserved all that is essential, possesses a succession of Bishops and Pastors, can occupy common ground with our Churches,* where dissenting bodies have but little hope for a better future."

---

* *Vide* An Eirenicon of the Eighteenth Century. Edited by Henry Nutcombe Oxenham. Introduction, p. 39. *Foot-note.*

† *Vide* Validity of the Holy Orders of the Church of England, by Dr. F. G. Lee, p. 277.

‡ The Catholic Directory, Ecclesiastical Register, etc. Sec. 3, iii. Anniversaries, p. 95 (1890).

§ This was published by the Archbishop. *See* Lee, Validity, etc., p. 277. *Note.*

Before a Parliamentary Committee the Archbishop expressed his desire for union between the Church of Rome and England; and, in a letter to Mr. Æneas Macdonnell, he stated that "were the Church of England people true to the principles laid down in their Prayer Book, the doctrinal differences, *which appear considerable, but are not*, would soon be removed."*

(From the present edition the compiler expunges the testimony of *Bishop Strossmayer*, for the following reasons: (*a*) Some learned critics on the Anglican side are of opinion that the Bishop's hypothetic method of argument is of insufficient weight in illustrating the facts for which this little work contends; (*b*) there are speakers and writers on the Roman side who claim that the passage was originally *forged* by some person unknown. Of their reasons for thinking so the compiler has spoken elsewhere. He is not convinced that their conclusion is supported by satisfactory evidence, but he omits the passage as a concession to those who have honest doubts as to its true authorship)

---

* An Eirenicon of the Eighteenth Century, with Introduction by H. N. Oxenham, M.A., p. 69.

SECTION VI.

Petrus Cudsemius on Catholic Order in the English Church; Admissions of Sander, Davenport, and Cressy; The case of Dr. Gough; Urban VIII's negotiations with English Bishops; Statements of Panzani, Skidmore, and Walsh; The view taken by Dr. Snellaerts.

To the testimony of Popes, Cardinals, Archbishops and Bishops, may be added that of many other learned Roman Catholics both clerical and lay.*

Petrus Cudsemius came to England in 1608, and in the following year wrote of the Anglican Episcopate:—

"With regard to the Catholic order, *there is a perpetual line of their Bishops, and the lawful succession of pastors received from the Church.*"†

Rev. Nicholas Sander, D.D., S.J., freely admits that Anglican Orders were "*confirmed*" by Cardinal Pole in the case of "*all Bishops which had been made* in the former schism, if so they were Catholic in their judgment of religion, as well as the six new Bishoprics which King Henry had created."‡ As this confirmation was made in obedience to an instrument set forth (as we have shown already) in the Pope's own name and authority, the very mention of the circumstance may be accepted as Dr. Sander's record of the reality of the Orders in question.

Very Rev. Christopher Davenport, D.D. (Father Francis of St. Clare) joined the Franciscan Order at Ypres in 1617, and was Principal Professor of Theology at Douay in

---

* It is a deeply interesting fact that many priests of the English Church, admitted to the Church of Rome, have firmly and persistently refused to be re-ordained; and some of these have, notwithstanding, been permitted by their superiors to continue the exercise of sacerdotal functions in the Church of their adoption.

† De Desperata Calvini Causa. Tractatus brevis. Cap. ii., p. 108.

‡ De Schismate Anglicano. Lib. ii., p. 306.

1626. He appears to have been very highly regarded in his Order, in which he held the responsible post of English Provincial no less than four times. He was the author of eighteen works in Theology. Answering objections made against the Anglican form of Ordination as insufficient, he refers to the Greek Catholic form (as being unlike the Roman) and adds :

"No one, however, denies that they are rightly ordained, because they have the substance. The same appears to be the right conclusion respecting the [Anglican] form used in this country."

And further :

"The imposition of hands is essential, by the consent of nearly all writers, which is in this office duly observed."*

Father Davenport† explains that in the Anglican consecration the Archbishop pronounces the words "with the imposition of hands of several Bishops."

Rev. Serenus Cressy, O.S.B. (Convent of St. Gregory in Douay, Paris) in 1653 published the second edition of a work entitled "Exomologesis." Under the headings given in a Table of Contents at the end of the book the following appear :— "Sec. 1, cap. 9. A Reflection upon the Calvinists and Lutheran Churches. Their first disadvantage, in comparison of the English Church.‡ Sec. 1, cap. 10. Apparent want yea, renouncing of a lawful succession of Ecclesiastical Governors and Teachers among Lutherans and Calvinists." In the second of these chapters Father Cressy writes :—

"A second thing wherein the Lutherans and Calvinists agreed to disagree with the *Church of England* was their want of *Bishops, and by consequence of a lawfully ordained clergy*. This was an inconvenience so much the more hard to be digested by mee, and which deserved neither excuse nor commiseration, because by reason of their want of Bishops at their first pretended Reformations they came to that shamelessnesse

---

* The Articles of the Anglican Church paraphrastically considered and explained. By Christopher Davenport, D.D. Reprinted by Rev. F. G. Lee, D.C.L. Article XXXVI : Explanation.

† He died in 1860 at the ripe age of eighty-two.

‡ The "first disadvantage" or point of difference from the English Church, Fr. Cressy regarded as private interpretation, apart from tradition, of books of Holy Scripture.

to seeke to palliate this defect by a desperate condemning of the Order itselfe, as a tyranny and usurpation crept into the Church against the expresse order of Christ and His Apostles; and though they (especially the French Calvinists) might afterwards have in some sort *remedied this defect by receiving a Clergy by the Ordination of the English Bishops* (whereto they have beene earnestly solicited, as namely by Bishop Morton) notwithstanding they utterly persisted in the utter refusall of suffering this important disadvantage to be cured: which perverse spirit of theirs *Arnobius (Cont Gen lib. 6)* elegantly describes in these words, *Quod semel sine ratione fecistis, ne videamini aliquando neciise, defenditis*, that is *That thing, which yee once unreasonably did, to avoid the imputation of having beene ignorant, yee still maintain.* Yea to that *rediculous impudence* have they arrived in Scotland, not many years since, as to admit one to publique Penance in the Church onely for having beene a Protestant Bishop."*

In other words, Father Cressy regarded it as "rediculous impudence" for these folk to deny that the office of the man whom they persecuted was of divine appointment. It is important to note that his sentiments as to the validity of Anglican Orders were shared by the Superior of his Order and by seven Professors of Theology, including the Master of the Faculty in Paris. Prior to his becoming "a Religious Priest of the Holy Order of St. Benedict" he had been a Priest of the English Church, but he was never re-ordained. He died on August 10, 1674. The late learned Roman Catholic layman, Mr. Charles Butler, said of him: "Among the Catholic writers in the reign of Charles II. none was more distinguished." (See Appendix *E.*).

Rev. Dr. Stephen Gough (Oratorian) was, prior to his secession to the Roman Church, Chaplain for some time to Charles I. He adhered to the conviction that his Priesthood was good and valid; and the Archbishop of Paris, being of the same opinion, allowed him (without re-ordination) to exercise the functions of a Priest in the Arch-Diocese. His case was, however, submitted to the Doctors of the Sorbonne (of whom there were many) who for four months investigated the subject of Anglican Ordinations. They

---

* Exomologesis, or Motives, etc. By Hugh Paulin de Cressy. Lately Deane of Laghlin, etc., who now calls himself *B. Serenus Cressy*, Religious Priest of the Holy Order of S. Benedict in the Convent of S. Gregory in Douay at Paris, etc., etc. Chapter X., pp. 29—30.

finally came to the formal decision that they were both valid and sufficient, and therefore declared in favour of Dr. Gough's Priesthood. Father Gough therefore continued the exercise of his sacerdotal duties with the consent of his ecclesiastical superiors; and his right to do so was openly upheld by the Vicar General of the Archdiocese of Paris and the Rev. Abbé Damas. An opposition arose among a party of ill-informed malcontents, and the whole question was again referred to a select commission of other Doctors of the Sorbonne, but with exactly the same result, the unequivocal judgment being that Anglican Orders were valid, and that Dr. Gough, therefore, was a true priest. The value of such testimony may be estimated when it is remembered that the decision was passed by what a learned writer on the subject calls "the most renowned and competent theological school of Latin Christendom."*

Very Rev. John Skidmore, D.D., B.C.L., O.S.B. (Otherwise known as *F. Leander de S. Martino, Congregationis Angliæ Benedictinorum Præses generalis.* Prior of S. Gregory; Titular Prior of the Catholic Church of Canterbury; Abbot-Designate of Cismar, Germany). He was sent by the Holy See in 1632, with the express sanction of Charles I, to obtain information about the English Church.† He had communications with Archbishop Laud (of which frequent mention is made in the State Papers), and reported that the greater part of the Anglican articles of faith "are truly orthodox." He drew a clear line between the Protestantism of Dissent and the faith and usage of English Catholics, for after mentioning many items of agreement with points of doctrine in the Roman Church he added:—

"They [the Anglicans] reverence the primitive Church, and unanimous consent of the ancient fathers and all traditions and ceremonies

---

* Lee, Validity of the Holy Orders of the Church of England. Ch. xxvi., Sec. 1, p. 297.

† Father Leander (together with his coadjutors of the same Order, Father Preston and Father David) was for some time an energetic supporter of the oath of allegiance. *Vide* Essays on the Re-union of Christendom (2nd series), p. 124.

which can be sufficiently proved by testimony of antiquity; admit a settled Liturgy taken out of the Roman Liturgy; *distinction of Orders, Bishops, Priests and Deacons*, in distinct habits from the laity; and divers other points in which no transmarine Protestants do agree."*

Father Skidmore died in 1635.

Rev. Gregorio Panzani (an Oratorian Priest of Arezzo; subsequently Bishop of Mileto) was sent in 1634 by Pope Urban VIII. to negotiate with Charles I., the English Government and Bishops, with instructions to report upon the condition of the English Roman Catholics and the Established Church. He was received very favourably by the King, and had several interviews with Sir Francis Windebank (Secretary of State) and Montague, Bishop of Chichester. The King expressed much regret at the separation of the Roman and Anglican Churches, and Sir Francis informed Father Panzani that but for the Jesuits and Puritans "an union might easily be effected." Father Panzani replied that with regard to the Jesuits "it is not improbable that His Holiness would sacrifice their interest in the prospect of so fair an acquisition." Bishop Montague assured him that both the Archbishops, the Bishop of London (Dr. Juxon), and all other members of the Anglican Episcopate but three, were favourable to an union of the Churches. Panzani reported the whole of the circumstances to his superiors at Rome, and was directed to convey the expression of their satisfaction to the English Bishops assuring them that His Holiness "would make no unreasonable demands, but content himself with the essentials of his Primacy, and such privileges as were annexed to it *jure divino*." Cardinal Barberini warmly expressed his approval of the proposed union, and Panzani wrote to His Eminence on July 16, 1636, saying that he was content to grow grey in accomplishing it.

The following brief passage, from this Priest's "Memoirs,"

---

* Windebank's MS in Father Leander's handwriting. Clarendon's State Papers. Vol. i., p. 207. Quoted in Mr. C. Butler's Book of the Roman Catholic Church, p. 2.

bears on the subject under consideration in the present treatise* :—

"In this Service [the Anglican] it must be allowed when it came to be regularly organized, there was a decency and dignity, well adapted to the sedate and philosophic character of the English people. The Churches were the same, *the orders of the hierarchy remained the same.*"

Very Rev. Peter Walsh. (Order of S. Francis. Professor of Divinity.) Of Dr. Matthew Parker, Anglican Archbishop of Canterbury, Father Walsh writes to the effect that he admits the valid and canonical character of his orders, and says, "You must not persuade yourself that I do *at all* reflect upon his ordination. He adds :—

"Were I to deliver my opinion of this matter, or were it my purpose to speak thereof, I would *certainly feel myself bound in conscience* (*for anything that I know yet*) *to concur with those who doubt not the ordination of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons in the Protestant Church of England to be at least valid* . . . I have withal observed nothing of truth alleged by the objectors which might in the least persuade any man who is acquainted with the known divinity or doctrine of our present school (besides what Richardus Armachanus long since writ), and with the annals of our Roman Church ; unless, peradventure, he would turn so frantic at the same, as to question even the validity also of our own ordination in the said Roman Church, etc."†

To this view as to the validity of Anglican Orders Father Walsh steadily adhered. The following expressions are from his later writings. Speaking of preventing giving offence to Roman Catholics by the attitude taken up by him, he says :—

"Where they shall meet the titles of Right or Most Illustrious and Most Reverend, given by me to the Lord Bishop of Lincoln, I desire them to consider my reasons.

"I had, about twelve years since, in the Preface to my History of the Irish Remonstrance, publicly in print, acknowledged my opinions to be that *the ordination of the Protestant Church of England is valid ; meaning it undoubtedly to be so* according both to the public doctrine of the Roman Catholic Schools themselves, and the Ancient Rituals of

---

* Memoirs of Panzani. Translated and edited, with Introduction by Rev. Joseph Berington. Introd. p. 17. (Father Berington was a Roman Priest "of acknowledged learning and piety." *Vide* An Eirenicon of the Eighteenth Century. Introd., p. 12, *footnote.*)

† The History and Vindication of the Loyal Formulary, or Irish Remonstrance, etc. By Father Peter Walsh, etc., Prefatory address, p. xlii.

all Catholic Churches, Latin and Greek; nay, and to those Rituals of all the Oriental Heterodox Churches too, as Morinus, a learned Oratorian, hath recorded them."*

He gives in full a letter of the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Gnesne and Primate of Poland to Archbishop Sheldon of Canterbury, dated July 11, 1675, beginning, *Reverendissime et Illustrissime Domine Amice Colendissime,* and ending, *Reverendissimæ et Illustrissimæ Dominationi vestrae additissimus et testor paratissimus Andraeas Olszousky Archiepiscopus Gnesnensis.* The letter is one of enquiry about the ancient privileges of the See of Canterbury.

Again, Father Walsh writes :—

"We do not, so far as I comprehend, deny that they [the Anglican Prelates] be *true Bishops.*"†

Very Rev. Père Snellaerts, S.T.P (Professor of History, Louvain) shared the same opinion. In 1684 His Eminence Cardinal Casanata wrote to the Bishop of Castoria to know what he thought on the subject of Anglican Orders. The Bishop consulted his two friends Snellaerts and Arnaud. Snellaerts replied that 'the fact is out of dispute,' and maintained that the form used in King Edward's Ritual contained all that was necessary for ordination.

---

* Preface to Four Letters. Printed Anno 1686.

† Quoted by Dr. F. G. Lee, Validity of the Holy Orders of the Church of England, p. 270.

SECTION VII.

Dr. Arnaud's Testimony; Correspondence of Sorbonne Doctors with Archbishop Wake in respect to Reunion; Declarations of Courayer; Approvals of the same; Le Grice on the English Priesthood.

Very Rev. Père Arnaud, S.T.P. (Doctor of the Sorbonne) wrote to the Bishop of Castoria no less emphatically, and his testimony is chiefly interesting as embracing the actual period about which some modern controversialists have made the most contention.

"*The fact, viz., that the Bishops in Queen Elizabeth's time were consecrated by true Bishops, appears to me undeniable.*"*

Very Rev. Père Du Pin, S.T.P. (Doctor of the Sorbonne).—In 1717 Father Du Pin and three other doctors of the Sorbonne expressed to Archbishop Wake their wish for a union of the Church of France with the Church of England "as the most effectual means to unite all the Western Churches." He declared that the Theological Faculty at Paris would be in harmony with such an object, and that the accomplishment thereof belonged to God. The object met with the approval of His Eminence Cardinal de Nouailles, Archbishop of Paris. In addressing the Anglican Archbishop, Father Du Pin adopted the tone of one writing to a Catholic Prelate, and signed one of his letters "your son in Christ" (*tuus in Christo filius*). Respecting the work by Bishop Forbes of Edinburgh, entitled *Considerationes Modestæ et Pacificæ Controversarium, etc.*, Du Pin expressed himself thus to His Grace, "The Bishop seems to be of the same mind as you and I, for the whole subject of the work turns on this, to show that the controversies between us may easily be settled,

---

* *Vide* **The Succession of Bishops in the Church of England unbroken, by E. C. Harrington, M.A., p. 4.**

f only the fairer theologians are heard on both sides, if dictation is avoided, and we are led, not by party spirit, but by love of seeking the truth." "The whole town," reported Dr. Osmund Beauvoir (Chaplain to the British Embassy in Paris) to the Archbishop, "rings of an union, and many openly declare that they wish it." On October 22nd, 1718, the same wrote to His Grace, "They [Du Pin and De Girardin] are extremely satisfied with the account of the succession of the English Bishops. For before they were in error about it." The same year Du Pin wrote to the Archbishop :—

"I was extremely pleased with what you were so good as to write to me so eloquently and accurately about the election and consecration of the Bishops in England. It does not seem to me to differ much from the customs which flourished in the time of Charlemagne, as is clear from the Capitulars of this and the following Emperors, and the formulæ of Marculfus. And I cannot sufficiently praise the precautions which you use to prevent any unworthy person from stealing into the Episcopate. Would that Bishops were proved in the same way everywhere, before they were consecrated."*

Du Pin drew up a *Commonitorium* approving twenty-three of the English articles as they stand, and admitting the remainder with explanations.

Rev. Père De Girardin, S.T.P. (Doctor of the Sorbonne).—In an Oration to the other Sorbonne Doctors, this learned Father recommended union between the English and Roman Churches. In December, 1718, he addressed himself as follows to Dr. Wake, Anglican Archbishop of Canterbury :—

"You can hardly think, most illustrious Prelate, with what joy it filled us, that we learnt at last, from your most learned letter, that the consecration of the English Bishops, in due succession from the first foundation to the Reformation (as they speak), is supported by the testimony of public documents; so that the enemies of ecclesiastical union have no ground, on this head at least, to disturb the communion of minds and of religion, now to be renewed among Christians."†

---

* *Vide* The Church of England, etc.; an Eirenicon, in a Letter to the Author of the Christian Year, by E. B. Pusey, D.D., etc., pp. 235—236 : also Maclaine's Translation of Mosheim's Eccl. History, Vol. V., Appendix iii.. pp. 146—168 (Ed. 1768).

† *Ibid*, pp. 231—236.

Very Rev. Père Pierre Francois Le Courayer, D.D.* (Canon of the Augustinian Abbey of St. Genevieve, near Paris; Professor of Theology, and Custodian of the Abbey Library).—He declared that "attachment to Catholic unity obliged him to yield to the truth"† respecting Anglican Orders, and he published a learned volume in their defence. The following are some of his utterances as to his unqualified belief in their validity:—

"The advantages which would arise from the Re-union of the Church of England with us ought naturally to incline us to favour whatever tends to prove the validity of their Ministry. . . . It will be easy to decide what ought to be thought of the practice of many Bishops who re-ordain the English; and I think men will be easily convinced by the proofs we have produced that this custom is contrary to all the received maxims of the Church in the matter of Re-ordinations, and that it is founded only upon chimerical facts, upon opinions that are abandoned, and upon doubts that have no foundations."‡ "As to the doubt it can have no place, so long as there are *proofs so certain* that the Ordination was performed by Bishops duly consecrated, and that all was there observed which could be essential to this Sacrament; and this, it appears to me, has been so demonstrated as to leave no reply."§ "When Morinus was at Rome, in 1639, he found a Congregation established to examine into the validity of the Greek Ordination. It was, therefore, doubted of at that time; and ought we to have given weight to such a doubt against *these* [*Anglican*] *Ordinations, of which no reasonable divine can question the validity?*"‖

"A certain Ordination makes a certain Bishop, and a man is truly a Bishop when he is one with certainty. But *the Ordination in question is certain;* for every Ordination is certain when it includes what is essential to Ordination, that is to say, imposition of hands, prayer, and the Consecrator. But such is the English Ordination, as has been shown at great length throughout this treatise, and as all those will be able to convince themselves who will take the trouble to investigate the facts."¶

"It is, of course, false again that they do not acknowledge in their Priests the power of offering such a sacrifice [the Eucharist] and that their Ordination does not confer it. For this power is included in that

---

* Died 1766. *Vide* Article in *Church Quarterly Review*, 1883, Vol. XVI.

† Letter to Mr. Williams, Paris, March 14, 1724.

‡ A Dissertation on the Validity of the Orders of the English, and of the Succession of the Bishops of the Anglican Church, etc., by P. Le Courayer (Author's Preface), pp. 21—22.

§ *Ibid.*, p. 200; ‖ p. 207; ¶ p. 212.

which is given them to administer the Sacraments, and to perform all the functions attached to the Priesthood of our Saviour. . . . *a thing which will appear certain to all those who will examine the matter without prejudice.*"*

"*We cannot hesitate, then, as to the reception of their Orders, unless at least we have two weights and two measures in the judyment we pass on the things of religion.* . . . There is no decree of the Church that declares the English Ordinations null.† "As for the reasons which support the Ordinations, as they are all founded on *evident facts and authentic monuments*, and as the opposite reasonings have no other foundation than mere possibilities in the air, and suspicions which aim at the annihilation of the most solemn Records, it does not appear that any comparison can be made between the two; and doubts which have for their foundation mere presumptions and prejudices can never decide as to the validity or invalidity of a Sacrament when these prejudices or these presumptions are destroyed by *proofs which are convincing to all those who seek less to dispute than to inform themselves.* . . . The establishing of the English Ordinations turns entirely to the advantage of the Catholic Church. The acknowledgment of their validity facilitates to us the means of our re-union with the English, and there is nothing for which we ought to wish with greater ardour. Though separated from us, they are still our brethren; nor is anything foreign to us of that which is marked with the seal of Jesus Christ."‡

Rev. Père D. Arnaudin (Censor), on the 1st October, 1721, gave not merely his approbation, but also high praise to the foregoing sentiments expressed by Père Courayer, thereby acknowledging that they embodied the expression of his own convictions.

Rev. Père des Fontaines (Inspector of Divinity Books in the Royal Library, France, 1724; Editor of the *Journal des Scavans*) gave public testimony to his favourable view of Anglican Orders.§

Rev. Père Caldaguez (Precentor of the Church of Montferrand), in a letter dated November 25, 1724, reiterated the convictions of Monseigneur Bossuet in relation to the subject, and at the same time spoke very highly of the proofs brought forward in Père Courayer's Dissertation.‖

---

* Pp. 227, 228.

† *Ibid.*, p. 252.

‡ *Ibid.*, pp. 298—299.

§ Editor's Introduction to Courayer's Work, p. xix.

‖ *Ibid.*, p. xxxv.

Rev. Père Des Molets (Author of the *Nouvelles Litteraires*), was also strongly on the same side, speaking of the criticism of opposition to Anglican Orders as "sound and judicious," whilst he characterised the reasons in their favour as "*overwhelming* in their force" and as being "pushed to demonstration." *

Rev. Père de Villiers (Censor), on June 14, 1726, issued an Approbation of Père Courayer's Dissertation in defence of the English Succession and Priesthood.†

Rev. Père John Le Grice (of Rouen), in a letter to a friend in France, in 1796, wrote as follows respecting the Church of England, her services, and her ministry:—

"Though *the Sacred Sacrifice is not offered as frequently as in the* [*Roman*] *Catholic Church*, yet the services and rites of the English Church are like our own, and, it is said, bear a great likeness to the services and rites of the Old Church before any changes were made. The Churches are frequently open and breathe a spirit of admirable doctrine and refined devotion. Baptism, Confirmation (without anointing), Marriage, the Sacrament of Communion are all given, according to venerable forms, very simple, by *clergy whose promotion to Sacred Orders, with care and preparation, is made by a manner perfectly in harmony with the respected customs of the Ancient Church.* . . . And the clergy who claim to have, *and who, I see no reason whatever to doubt, possess the same character as pastors and priests as their spiritual forefathers*, have always received, and retain until now, the confidence and affection of their people. There is not a little to be learnt from observing the manner in which the Church of England is respected and reverenced; *nor can the most anxious critic discover the absence of anything that is essential to the efficacy of the same with their flocks*"‡

---

* Nouvelles Litteraires, Dec. 1723, pp. 34—35.

† Editor's Introduction to Courayer's Work, p. xxxii.

‡ Quoted by Rev. Dr. F. G. Lee. Validity of the Holy Orders of the Church of England. *Appendices.* No. 3, p. 521.

SECTION VIII.

Canon Estcourt on the requisites for valid Ordination, on Parker's Consecration, and the Nag's Head Fable; Dr. Lingard's contest with opponents on the subject of Parker's Consecration.

Very Rev. T. H. Canon Estcourt (of Birmingham; a distinguished Roman Catholic Priest and controversialist).—In quoting a Resolution of the Sacred Congregation of the Holy Office of 1704, Father Estcourt adds these words :—

"Such is this most important decision. And it will be seen at once that nothing could be more favourable to the Anglican side of the question. For it establishes the principle that the words *Accipe Spiritum Sanctum* are sufficient as a form of ordination to the priesthood; it renders nugatory the argument raised by Talbot and Lewgar, that the distinctive order must be named in the form: it makes it clear that even if the Anglican form of the diaconate is invalid, this need not prevent the priesthood being validly conferred; it removed any doubt whether the uncanonical mode of altering the Anglican form would of itself have made it invalid; and it puts aside, as irrelevant, any questions whether the alteration was made by the Church or by the secular power."*

Again, he writes that :—

"A sacrament conferred with the correct matter and form by a heretic, or even an atheist, is valid, if he intends to do that rite which the Church does—and not specially the Roman Church, but the Church *in confuso;* even though he might not believe in the reality of the sacrament."†

Canon Estcourt moreover states that "it is *impossible to doubt*" that Parker was consecrated, and, with regard to the Nag's Head argument set forth by some to disparage the Anglican Priesthood and Succession, he says :—

"It is very unfortunate that the Nag's Head story was ever seriously put forward; for it is so absurd on the face of it, that it has led to the suspicion of [Roman] Catholic theologians not being sincere in the objections they make to Anglican Orders."‡

---

* Estcourt. The question of Anglican Ordinations, p. 192.
† *Ibid.*, p. 199.
‡ *Ibid.*, p. 154.

Rev. John Lingard, D.D., is accounted one of the first historians of modern times. He studied at Douay, and was for forty years Priest-in-charge of the Roman Catholic Church of St. Mary's, Hornby, Lancaster. A Cardinal's hat is said to have been offered to him, which he declined. The testimony of this learned writer is peculiarly valuable in answer to the false allegation (*a*), that Barlow (one of the Episcopal consecrators of Dr. Parker) was no Bishop,* and (*b*), that the consecration was conducted in mock fashion in a beer-house.† We may quote the following :—

"Their [the clergy's] head, Elizabeth resolved to place, as metropolitan, both through respect to the memory of her mother, and in reward of his own merit, Dr. Matthew Parker, formerly chaplain to Anne Boyleyn. In obedience to a congé d'elire he was chosen by a portion of the chapter—the major part refusing to attend—but four months were suffered to elapse between his election and his entrance on the archiepiscopal office. . . . Four of the commissioners, Barlow, the deprived Bishop of Bath, and Hodgkins, once Suffragan of Bedford, *who had both been consecrated according to the Catholic Pontifical*, and Scory, the deprived Bishop of Chichester, and Coverdale, the deprived Bishop of Exeter, *who had both been consecrated* according to the reformed Ordinal, proceeded to confirm Parker *and then to consecrate* him after the form adopted towards the close of the reign of Edward VI."‡

Dr. Lingard disowns the Nag's Head Fable. In the body of his work he makes no allusion to it when relating Dr. Matthew Parker's consecration. But in a supplementary note, the following passage occurs :—

"Before I conclude this note, I ought perhaps to mention a story which was once the subject of acrimonious controversy between the divines of the two communions. It was said that Kitchen and Scory,

---

* The theory that Barlow, one of the consecrators of Archbishop Parker of Canterbury, was not himself a Bishop, was never even raised by any Roman Catholic until 1616, forty-seven years after the former Prelate's death, and eighty after his accession to the see of St. Davids.

† A fiction invented by an exiled Anglo-Roman Priest (Father Holywood) in Antwerp. *Vide* Haddan's Apostolical Succession in the Church of England, p. 180.

‡ A History of England from the first invasion by the Romans to the commencement of the Reign of William the Third. By John Lingard, D.D. A New Edition, corrected and considerably enlarged, in thirteen volumes, 1844. Vol. VII., pp. 262—263.

with Parker and other Bishops elect, met in a tavern called the Nag's Head, that Kitchen on account of a prohibition by Bonner, refused to consecrate them, that Scory therefore ordering them to kneel down, placed the Bible on the head of each, and told them to rise up Bishops. Of this tale, concerning which so much has been written, I can find no trace in any author or document of the reign of Elizabeth."*

Certain ill-informed persons ventured to call in question the testimony given by Dr. Lingard, whereupon he wrote at great length in reply.† A few definite statements as to his personal belief (founded on historical proofs) as to the reality of Dr. Parker's consecration are subjoined.

"I have asserted that Archbishop Parker was consecrated on the 17th of December, 1559. . . . I owe it to myself to prove to your readers the truth of my statement, and the utter futility of any objection which can be brought against it."

"In my judgment, the comparison of these facts with those that preceded the 17th of December, forms so strong a case that *I should not hesitate to pronounce in favour of the consecration*, if even all direct and positive evidence respecting it had perished. *But there exists such evidence in abundance.*" Now to *this mass of evidence, direct and indirect*, what do your correspondents oppose?"

"I am not aware of any open denial of the facts till about fifty years afterwards, when the tale of the foolery supposed to have been played at the Nag's Head was published."

"With them [certain opponents of Anglican Orders] the great error of which I have been guilty, is that *I state Barlow to have been a Catholic Bishop* in the reign of Henry VIII., whereas they are positive that he never received episcopal consecration at all." [Dr. Lingard then cites the most convincing proofs of Barlow's episcopal character, and adds] "Is there any positive proof that he was no Bishop? None in the world. . . . *Why should we doubt the consecration of Barlow and not that of Gardiner? I fear that the only reason is this: Gardiner did not consecrate Parker, but Barlow did.*"

"The fact, however, is that Parker was consecrated on the next Sunday but one, by the four commissioners, in the chapel of Lambeth, and according to the Ordinal of Edward VI. This appears from the archiepiscopal register, from Parker's diary, from the 'Antiquitates' and from the indisputable facts which I mentioned in my former communication. What can be opposed to these authorities? Any direct testimony? No: but that the passages in the register, the diary, and the printed books are fabrications. The charge of forgery is one easily

---

* Elizabeth. Ch. V., *Note.*

† Birmingham Catholic Magazine. 1834. Vol. V., pp. 704—715, 774—782.

made, and, therefore, requires proof to support it; it is the last refuge of the obstinate and dishonest; and, therefore, if it be disproved, recoils with double force against those who make it."

After much testimony in proof of his position, Dr. Lingard states that his opinion was the result of a long and patient investigation; and he adds, "I have yet to learn what reason there may be to doubt its truth, or regret its adoption." Again he says, "Your correspondents are suspicious of all Protestant testimony, let them take then the testimony of a Catholic." He proceeds to quote certain records of Sander, the contemporary Roman Catholic historian, and states that contemporary testimony adverse to the truth of English Orders "never had existence, except in the imagination of writers, who, having adopted the Fable of the Nag's Head consecrations, found themselves compelled to adopt other fables, in order to bolster up the first." "If I am in error, nothing can be more easy than to expose that error. . . . The discussion, however, has led me to the discovery of additional proofs."

Father Lingard died at Hornby, July 13, 1851, and was buried at Ushaw College, near the City of Durham.

SECTION IX.

The case of Fr. Trelawney; Admissios of Moehler and Hutton; strong expressions of Oxenham and Ffoulkes.

Rev. Sir Harry Trelawney, Bart., to whom we have already made some passing reference,* received Anglican Orders, and many years afterwards seceded to the Church of Rome. He insisted that his English Ordination had been a valid one and that he needed not, therefore, to be re-ordained as a priest. With the full knowledge and consent of the authorities he said Mass with frequency, and performed this and other sacerdotal functions for the space of nearly thirty years in England, France, and Italy. It is said that he never omitted the daily repetition of the Divine Office of the Breviary. Later in life, however, to satisfy the scruples of certain co-religionists in Rome, Father Trelawney consented to receive *conditional* re-ordination (the sacramental form remaining untouched) although he fully convinced his ordainer, Cardinal Odescalchi, that he was a true priest prior to the performance of the ceremony (1830). Father Trelawney contended to the day of his death that English Orders are good and valid.

Very Rev. John Adam Moehler, D.D. (Dean of Wurtzburg, Bavaria, Knight of the Order of St. Michael, and late Professor of Theology at the University of Munich), draws a distinction between the Anglican *Church* and the Presbyterian *System*, and shows that in the former we find the "divine institution of episcopacy asserted." Yet further, in drawing a comparison between the Anglican and Lutheran bodies, he frankly admits that the Church of England possesses "a Catholic hierarchy."†

---

* *Vide ut supra* respecting Cardinal Odescalchi's testimony; also see reference in footnote thereto.

† Symbolik. Robertson's Translation (Chas. Dolman), 1843. Two Vols. *Vide Introd.* p. 25; also Vol. II., p. 132.

Rev. Arthur Wollaston Hutton, (formerly of the Oratory of St. Philip Neri) granted that the expressed intention of the English Ordinal to "continue" the previously existing orders is "a distinct witness to the general good intention with which the Anglican Ordinal was devised." He added testimony which, however reluctantly given (and whatever his personal misconception, as therein shown, respecting Anglican teaching) appears to be distinctly in favour of Anglican Orders in so far as the correct "matter and form" are used. He wrote :—

"A Catholic may readily grant that the Prayer Book Ordinal, as it now stands, if not as it stood in Queen Elizabeth's days, employs matter and form in themselves so far sufficiently definite, that if it had come down from a remote antiquity in a community that had continuously preserved, though in an undeveloped form, the true Catholic doctrine on the Sacrament of Holy Order, and on the Sacrifice of the Mass, there would probably have been no difficulty in obtaining from Rome a decision favourable to the validity of the Orders conferred by its use."*

It will be seen that Father Hutton here, firstly suggests that the Ordinal has not come down from a remote antiquity, yet "readily grants" that it has retained "sufficiently definite matter and form;" and secondly supposes that the doctrine of the English Church has hindered the general and decisive acceptance of Anglican Orders by the Roman Church. It has, however, been the custom of the Papal Communion to admit validity of Orders (conferred with the correct matter and form) in bodies of Christians which it has yet declared to be both heretical and schismatical; therefore, even supposing the English Church had never upheld the doctrines of the Apostolic Succession and the Eucharistic Sacrifice, learned Roman Canonists and Divines would not feel that they were entitled to have doubts on the grounds set forth by Father Hutton.

---

* The Anglican Ministry: its Nature and Value in relation to the Catholic Priesthood, 1879, pp. 145—165. [The compiler is given to understand that, since this work was written, Father Hutton's views in religion have undergone some change; but this does not touch the question of what he published in former years as an Oritorian Priest and accredited teacher of the Roman faith.]

The acceptance of heretical tenets* is not regarded as a bar to the possibility of Orders, so long as the consecrator or ordainer has the general intention to do what the Church does in the matter; and on evidence of repentance of error on the part of any recipients (as in the case of Cathari, Massalians or Euchites, Eutychians, and Donatists) their "character," received by the grace of Holy Order, has been admitted by the priestly body of the Catholic Church. "Si clerici fuerint, maneant clerici, si laici, ad communionem admittantur."† S. Leo declares definitely that if he who has fallen into the temptation of heresy returns, and shows his repentance by condemning his errors in writing, he is not denied the recognition of his orders.‡

Rev. Henry Nutcombe Oxenham was ordained in the English Church in 1854, and seceded to the Church of Rome in 1857. After his reception into the papal communion he continued to be a frequent attendant at Anglican services, and was also to be seen at Meetings in furtherance of the Re-union of Christendom. In a sermon on "Unity a Motive of Action and a Pledge of Grace" he gave utterance to the following sentiments :—

"The Catholic Church is, and ever has been, One. But I am concerned here, not with dogmatic verities, but outward facts. The Church is One, but the unity of Christendom is broken. . . . Christendom has presented the spectacle of three great bodies at enmity with each other." "It is obvious, then, to mark certain benefits which would accrue from Re-union to the different parts of the Christian body. *Anglicanism*, without losing it natural character, or its heritage of independent thought, *would acquire fresh strength for its supernatural mission* in teaching the complete Christian dogma, and ministering in their fulness the sacraments of grace." §

In 1869 he wrote to Dr. F. G. Lee‖ :—

"I can have no hesitation in saying that the evidence in favour of

---

* *Vide* Holy Order. A Catechism. By Charles S. Grueber, etc., 1883, pp. 125—126.

† Labbe., Tom. I., p. 1627.

‡ S. Leo, Epis. xiii., al. 27 ad Pulcher, August.

§ Sermons on the Re-union of Christendom, pp. 78—80.

‖ Lee. Validity of the Holy Orders of the Church of England, pp. 285—286, where the Letter (dated August 28, 1869) is given in full.

the Anglican succession has always appeared to me morally conclusive; and the point is, of course, one that admits of moral demonstration only. The subject has been distinctly before my mind for the last sixteen years at least. . . . But I have seen no reason to change my original opinion. On the contrary, a fuller acquaintance with all the details of the arguments on either side, as it presents itself to different minds, *has only confirmed me in the very decided conviction that no case can be made out against the Validity of Anglican Orders which would not tend by inevitable consequence to shake the validity of every ordination—and therefore of every Sacrament depending on ordination—administered throughout Christendom from the beginning.*"

To the day of his death he remained, apparently, unshaken in this view. In 1880 he wrote to Mr. W. Probyn-Nevins * :—

"In many ways I prefer the Anglican to the Roman Church, and, were I still in it, would not go over to Rome, with the Vatican Council staring me in the face."

He died in March, 1888, aged 58.

Rev. Edmund S. Ffoulkes, B.D., wrote in 1869 to the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Westminster :—

"If Queen Elizabeth was deposed, the Council of Trent had abstained deliberately from affirming that the Bishops who had been consecrated in her reign and at her bidding were no Bishops. . . . Anglican Orders, if they have not been recognised in practice, have never been declared invalid, still less the grounds of their invalidity set forth. . . . If I had to die for it, I could not possibly subscribe to the idea that the Sacraments to which I am admitted week after week in the Roman communion—Confession and the Holy Eucharist, for instance—confer any grace, any privileges, essentially different from what I used to derive from these Sacraments, frequented with the same dispositions, in the Church of England. On the contrary, I go so far as to say that, comparing one with another strictly, some of the most edifying communions that I can remember in all my life were made in the Church of England, and administered to me by some that have since *submitted to be re-ordained in the Church of Rome: a ceremony, therefore, which, except as qualifying them to undertake duty there, I must consider superfluous.* . . . Holding myself that there are realities attaching to the Sacrament of an objective character, I am persuaded, and have been more and more confirmed in this conviction as I have grown older, that the Sacraments administered in the Church of England are realities, objective realities, to the same extent as any that

---

* Mr. Probyn-Nevins published extracts from his Letters some years later in the *Church Times*, and this is one of them.

I could now receive at your hands: so that you yourself, therefore, consecrated the Eucharist as truly when you were Vicar of Lavington as you have ever done since."*

"I trust the day is not far distant when the religiously minded in both communions will insist on associating together as brethren, and learning from each other as Christians, and combining for works of charity without distinction of nations. . . . With these convictions, it may seem superfluous in me to add my belief that, *having been ordained priest in the Church of England, I am a priest still.*"†

---

* The Church's Creed or the Crown's Creed? A Letter to the Most Rev. Archbishop Manning, etc. By Edmund S. Ffoulkes, B.D., pp. 44—46. [The Rev. E. S. Ffoulkes wrote these words at a time when he might fairly be said to have been one of the most learned and notable converts won by the Roman Church. Later on, he addressed Archbishop Manning on the subject of the Roman Index and its recent proceedings. His bold and honest admission of facts does not appear to have met with much sympathy. Eventually he returned to the English Church.]

† *Ibid.*, pp. 56—57.

SECTION X.

Charles Butler declares Parker's consecration indisputable; De Lisle convinced as to the validity of the Anglican Ordinations; Pugin deprecates attacks on the Church of England; Conclusion.

Mr. Charles Butler (a distinguished Roman Catholic layman) wrote in 1826 :—

"I am unable to understand those who maintain that the Protestant Bishops went through a mock consecration at a tavern in Cheapside. *If there is one historical fact, for which the existing evidence should render it undisputed, it is the fact of the consecration of Dr. Parker at Lambeth on December* 17, 1559."*

Mr. Ambrose L. M. P. De Lisle (of Garendon Park and Grace Dieu Manor, Leicestershire) wrote in 1844 at considerable length on the subject of English Orders to the Rev. Dr. F. G. Lee. After stating that he had been challenged to disprove their validity, he adds :—

"*As I had never disputed their validity, and, on the contrary, was inclined to admit it,* I at first intended to decline the challenge; but the Provincial of the Dominicans, the late Father John Wood, urging me to undertake the discussion in print, I said to him that I was not the man to do it, for *I saw no reason to dispute the validity of Anglican Orders.* However, after some discussion, I agreed to write on the subject, if the Provincial would furnish me with all the arguments in favour of his view, *i.e.*, to prove the invalidity of the Anglican Orders. Accordingly I wrote several letters which were published in the *Leicester Journal*, and in which the whole anti-Anglican argument was most elaborately put forward. But these letters were so *convincingly answered* by the Anglican clergyman who had challenged me, that I felt constrained, as an honest man, publicly to acknowledge that he had beaten me hollow, and, as I verily believed, proved his point."

"The existence of true Orders in any separated Church must ever be a source of consolation to all true Catholics; inasmuch as it implies the existence and benefit of the Holy Sacraments as a means of grace and salvation for all those separate brethren who are in good faith; and, above all, because it constitutes an organic link for the renewal of intercommunion and a restoration of Catholic Unity, when God's good time shall arrive for healing the breaches of the spiritual Jerusalem."†

---

* *Vide* Lee. Validity of the Holy Orders of the Church of England, p. 186.

† *Ibid.*, pp. 279—281.

Mr. Augustus Welby Pugin wrote a work entitled, "Church and State; or, Christian Liberty," which met with the approval of the late Cardinal Newman. Writing to Mr. E. W. Pugin, respecting his father's book, he said: "It has given me great pleasure to read it. It is an exposition of great and most important principles, and is written in a frank, straightforward, forcible style." The following are some of the passages in Mr. Pugin's book which received so high an encomium :—

"It is lamentable to consider the amount of ignorance that prevails respecting the real system of the Church of England, not only among the English [Roman] Catholic body, but among persons who profess to be members of its communion. . . . It is a sad and afflicting spectacle to see good and conscientious men, when really *acting up to what they are bound to perform*, exposed to all the persecutions of the State and the brutality of insolent and wealthy laymen, who, ignorant of any ecclesiastical principles or historical facts, assail the pastors of the Church to which they ostensibly belong if they carry out the very rubrics of the Ordinals, and administer its rites in reverence and solemnity."*

"If the truth be spoken, after the first race of Elizabethan Puritans, *the Anglican Bishops have been respectable tenants of the Sees.* . . . Indeed, if we can bring ourselves to regard the Anglican Church abstractedly from all the Acts of the State in connexion with her, we shall find much to reverence and admire. . . . It is, indeed, remarkable that in no official act is the Church of England committed to the term Protestant; it does not occur in the Liturgy or any authoritative office, nor in the Articles or Canons, and, in the bidding prayer she prays for the whole state of Christ's Catholic Church, and especially for that part of it established in this dominion—language which can only admit of one interpretation. Now, in opposition to this, the vulgar Protestant idea is that before the Reformation all the old clergy were turned out, and that Cranmer, Ridley, and Latimer were the fathers of the new system, to whom it owed its existence; and, to such an extent has this false idea prevailed, that a few years ago men, filling high positions in the leading University, got up a cross to commemorate those arch-heretics as founders of the English Church. Such is the low and popular Protestant view. Now let us examine the ordinary [Roman] Catholic idea that prevails among our own body, and which is very little nearer to the truth than the one I have described. All, anterior to the Reformation, is regarded and described as a sort of Utopia. . . . I once lived in Utopia myself, but when tested by stern facts and history, it all melts away like a dream. . . . Let

* Church and State; or, Christian Liberty. (Third Edition, 1875), p. 21.

any reasonable man, then, reflect on *the enormous difficulties that the Catholic religion had to contend with in preserving its position, and maintaining the truth*, and which *will be evident to all who attentively study the chronicles of English Church history in all their bearings and details.*"* "After the Church became part of the State it was the regular means of enforcing religious observances; but *that its clergy and its rites were created by Act of Parliament is utterly untrue.*"†

Shortly before his death Mr. Pugin expressed his disgust at the circulation of the foolish Nag's Head fable about Anglican Ordinations; "for," said he, "slander is a poor substitute for argument."

Further testimony need scarcely be given in evidence of the nature of the convictions of numerous learned Roman Catholics respecting England's ancient Church. Her Bishops have received their commission in unbroken succession from the Holy Apostles, and retain the old sees as the recognised rightful occupants; her priests administer the Bread of Life as in the ages past from the same Altars. It is true that of later years the Church of Italy has set up an alien hierarchy on English soil, but it is in no way recognised by the Catholic Communion of the country. The prelates subject in England to a foreign Pontiff simply represent the modern leaders of the body of Roman Nonconformists which was first formed in the year 1570.

With the most earnest desire to take a charitable view of the Roman system in England, it is impossible in common honesty to regard it otherwise than as intrusive. From the standpoint of the Œcumenical Councils of the undivided Church, we should, indeed, have to use a stricter and harsher term, and declare the body of the Italian Church in England to be schismatical. What is the true history of the division which took place between the Roman and Greek communions? "Not till the beginning of the thirteenth century did events occur of such importance as to lead to a lasting schism and rooted hostility between East and West. The conquest of Constantinople, the spoliation and desecration of the Greek Churches, the erection of the Latin Empire, above all, the

* Church and State; or, Christian Liberty. (Third Edition, 1875), pp. 22—24.

† *Ibid.*, p. 27.

part which Innocent III. took throughout by supporting these acts of violence with the whole weight of his authority and power, and openly forwarding the subjugation and Latinisation of the Eastern Church—these are the deeds which dug the chasm that has not been bridged over to this day. Then a swarm of Latin priests pressed greedily into the East, and, though ignorant of the very language of the country, opposed the national clergy, with the pride and tyranny of conquerors. The bishops and priests of the country were compelled to leave it; otherwise their Churches and revenues were robbed, or they themselves forced to adopt the Latin ritual. It was a drama of insolent tyranny and harsh oppression such as the Christian World had never before witnessed. The Popes and their legates set up altar against altar, placed ignorant Italians and Frenchmen as Patriarchs and Bishops over the Greeks, and even transplanted the Inquisition with its auto-da-fé on to the Greek soil (thirteen Greek priests were burnt in Cyprus). And we look in vain for any spiritual good or profit that accrued to the Eastern Christians from the long-enduring invasion of the Western Church."*

The fact remains that the Bishops of the Italian Church can have no canonical exercise of power in other countries, within the Dioceses of Bishops who already possess jurisdiction. Two bodies of Christians cannot independently represent the true Catholic Church of a country; and, as far as Catholics in England are concerned, it is inconceivable that so blessed an object as corporate unity can ever be attained unless Englishmen who have allied themselves to a foreign ecclesiastical power return to the obedience of the Holy Anglican Church. And why should not so happy a state of things be desired? Nay, more; why should not its consummation be devoutly prayed for? Even the fact that we still see the representatives of a foreign ecclesiastical body setting up altar against

* Speech of Rev. Dr. Ignatius von Döllinger (Counsellor of the Empire, Provost of the Royal Chapter, and Professor of Theology at Munich) at the Bonn Conference, Sept., 1874. *Vide* Report of the Proceedings of the Reunion Conference held at Bonn. Translated from the German of Professor Reusch, by E. M. B., pp. 24—26.

altar and ministry against ministry, should not discourage us. Nought is impossible with Him whose Beloved Son prayed for unity in His Church. Our plain duty is to add our supplications to His, to pray in loving charity for the return of our separated brethren in England, and vigorously to check all doubt or despair of their own bishops leading them eventually to submission to their true Patriarch in the ancient Catholic See of Canterbury.

URCH DIVINITY SCHOOL
of the
LIBRARY

APPENDICES.

A.—ATTITUDE OF VARIOUS MEMBERS OF THE HOLY EASTERN CHURCH TOWARD THE ANGLICAN COMMUNION.

THE PATRIARCH OF ALEXANDRIA wrote to the Archbishop of Canterbury in the following terms, June, 1887:—"Most Reverend Archbishop of Canterbury, Exarch of all England, my Lord Metropolitan Brother, Beloved in Christ, my Lord Edward, we embrace your Reverence in the Lord, and in gladness address you."

SOPHRONIOS, ARCHBISHOP OF CYPRUS, to the Bishop of Salisbury:—"Right Rev. Brother in Christ,—Your affectionate letter has reminded us of the many attentions which we received from both clergy and laity of Great Britain, and has given us an opportunity of again returning our thanks to all the pious company of the Christian Church of England."

And he goes on to speak of English Churchmen as the "beloved brethren in Christ, far off in body, but near in spirit."*

THE ARCHBISHOP OF ZANTE, at the consecration of Dr. Lawrence (the Bishop of Massachusetts), read in English an address, in which he expressed his pleasure "in being with them and participating in the ceremonies of a Church in which he could truly say is consecrated the hope of the Christian Church of the world. You are at the same time Catholics, and you will continue to draw to you the attention of the Catholic Church. All Christian Churches will cast their eyes toward you in the future, when, by the grace of God, all take steps for the union of all the Christian world under one authority and under one sceptre. In this hope I greet you as my brethren in Christ. I embrace your Church—this Church—as my Church."†

LYCOURGOS, (LATE) ARCHBISHOP OF SYRA AND TENEDOS, in a speech at Ely, in 1870, said, "When I return to Greece I will say that the Church of England is a sound Catholic Church, very like our own."

---

* *Illustrated Church News*, Jan. 6, 1894.

† Diocese of Fond du Lac, Vol. ii., No. 9, Nov., 1893.

VERY REV. DR. DIONYSIUS PLAISAS, Archimandrite, writes that he is "most fervently praying for the union of our Churches."*

VERY REV. JOHANNES JANYSCHEW, Rector of the Clerical Academy at St. Petersburg, stated at the Bonn Conference of 1874, "We should rejoice if further research should lead to the establishment of the validity of English Orders."†

VERY REV. ZEIOS RHOSSIS, Professor in the Theological Seminary at Rhigarim, and Student at the University of Athens, at the same Conference said, "Anglican Bishops and priests are very highly esteemed in the Greek Church. Some years ago, Gregory, the former Patriarch of Constantinople, and other Greek Bishops, exchanged letters with English Bishops, in which they greeted one another as 'brethren in Christ.' But the question of episcopal succession in the English Church, and the Churches derived from her, has not yet been determined by the Greek Church, though I hope it will be determined before long."‡

To the foregoing expressions of kindly feeling toward the English Church may be added the utterances of an Archimandrite in the course of a correspondence in the columns of the *West London Observer:*— "Permit me, as a member of the oldest branch of the great Catholic Church—viz., the Greek Church (from which the Romans seceded, and became apostate from the ancient faith), to state that all right-minded Catholics agree so far with the writer of the letter signed 'An English Catholic' as to freedom of speech. It is a great pity discussion on religious subjects is not liked by the Roman Catholic section, who are really like ourselves, Nonconformists in these isles, as the Ecclesiastical State Church of England we recognise as an important branch of the great Catholic Church, and was established prior to the Roman Mission, which arrived to evangelise the country. . . . The Pope, or Bishop of Rome, is only the head of that portion which adheres to the Roman doctrines of the Council of Trent, and has no authority over the Greek, English, or other Catholics. Shakespeare said, 'There is no ignorance, but darkness,' so let all branches of the Catholic Church for the future be allowed free ventilation of religious subjects."§

---

* Letter to Rev. Montagu R. Butler, Feb. 10, 1893.

† Report of the Proceedings of the Reunion Conference held at Bonn. Translated by E. M. B., p. 54.

‡ *Ibid.*

§ *Vide Church Review*, June 1, 1893.

B.—OLD CATHOLIC DIVINES ON THE SUBJECT OF ENGLISH ORDERS.

"The solution of the question depends solely on an examination of historical evidence, and I must give it as the result of my investigations that I have no manner of doubt as to the validity of the episcopal succession in the English Church."—Dr. VON DOLLINGER, Counsellor of the Empire, Provost of the Royal Chapter, and Professor of Theology at Munich (at the Bonn Conference, 1874).*

"I must own that my historical researches have led me to the same conclusion as to the validity of English Orders."† . . . "I gladly believe that the Anglican and the Old Catholic Churches which possess the true Succession of Bishops, as also a Priesthood duly consecrated by the Lord, are especially called, by the spirit of reconciliation which actuates them, to bring back Christendom to higher unity."‡—Dr. JOSEPH H. REINKENS, Bishop.

"The Old Catholics do not doubt the validity of English Orders. . . . That such theologians as Newman and Manning allowed themselves to be re-ordained was an offence almost entirely beyond the scope of reparation."—Dr. ED. HERZOG, Bishop.§

C.—JURISDICTION OF THE ANGLICAN EPISCOPATE.

One of the French clergy, in a most courteous letter to the compiler of this little work, whilst admitting that proofs of Anglican Orders can be produced, urges very strongly an acceptance of the papal claim to universal jurisdiction and confirmation of episcopates. An acknowledgment of this claim on the part of our Bishops, the good Abbé regards as of paramount importance in the interests of unity. It may be well to give two brief quotations which, with great conciseness, express the Anglican position in relation to this subject:—

"There are Roman Catholics who, allowing our Orders, yet demur to

---

* Report of the Proceedings of the Reunion Conference held at Bonn. Translated by E. M. B., p. 51.

† *Ibid.*, p. 53.

‡ Letter from Bishop Reinkens to Rev. M. R. Butler, October 14, 1890.

§ Letter from Bishop Herzog to Rev. M. R. Butler, March 14, 1892.

our possessing Jurisdiction. . . . Jurisdiction is sometimes regarded as a gift of power superadded to the gift of Orders. But it is really nothing more than the apportioning the limits within which this gift may be exercised. . . . To say that our Bishops and priests have no jurisdiction, is simply to claim that the Pope has the right and power to fix for English Bishops and English Priests their spheres of labour. Bishops and Priests have, in themselves, as a consequence of Order, their full inherent powers."*

"If the Bishops and Archbishops of the Church of England hold the jurisdiction of their sees and provinces by Divine right as well as on continuous succession, the intrusion into their sees of the Roman Bishops is wilfully schismatic; but, on the other hand, if the Pope by Divine right is a fourth Order in himself, superior to, and containing in himself alone, all legitimate Bishops, then of course the English Bishops are illegitimate, and the English Church is schismatic. One or the other *must* be in schism, and any member of the Church of England who denies that Rome is schismatic in England thereby brands his own brethren and himself with bastardy."†

D.—BISHOP JEBB AND THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CLERGY.

Forster's Life of Bishop Jebb contains a very interesting record of the relations which existed between that good prelate and Roman ecclesiastics. On Sunday, Dec. 16, 1821, when Archdeacon of Emly, he was presented by the Roman Catholic priest of Murroe, after Mass, to a crowded congregation in the Chapel, and "addressed the people from the Altar for fully half-an-hour. He was heard with breathless attention: some were affected to tears." As Bishop of Limerick, he was on equally happy terms with the Roman Catholic Bishop and his clergy. The latter prelate, "while he conversed with him as a friend, honoured him as a Christian Bishop, and advised with him as fellow-labourers in

---

* The Roman Question. (In Letters to a Friend.) By Rev. T. T. Carter, M.A. Letter viii., page 88.

A very useful work on the subject is also Apostolical Succession. A Plain Treatise on Holy Orders and Jurisdiction in the Church of England. By Rev. Herbert George Morse, M.A. Pages 46 to 49 are particularly valuable.

† *Church Times*, May 5, 1893.

the vineyard of their common Lord. The spirit of their ecclesiastical superior diffused itself among the Roman Catholic priesthood of Limerick." One of the last walks taken by Bishop Jebb through the streets of that city, presented the gratifying sight of his "walking arm in arm with a Roman Catholic priest, who, on taking leave, turned and bent the knee, as to his own ecclesiastical superior." When Bishop Jebb fell ill, "the affectionate interest taken by his own clergy, from his valued friend, Dean Preston, to the youngest Curates of the united diocese, was beautifully emulated by the Roman Catholic bishop and priesthood. The personal enquiries of the titular bishop, Dr. Ryan, were unremitting; and they were rendered doubly acceptable by the assurance, with tears in his eyes, that they were accompanied by his constant and fervent prayers. By the Rev. Mr. Wright, the Roman Catholic clergyman with whom the Bishop had taken one of his last walks, and who had effectually co-operated with him in the establishment of the 'Sick and Indigent Room-Keepers' Charity,' prayers to Almighty God were publicly offered up in his Chapel, in which the congregation were affectionately invited to join, for the restoration of 'the good Bishop of Limerick.'" "The address of the officiating priest melted the whole congregation, composed chiefly of the lower classes, into tears. 'I have,' he said, 'fifteen thousand poor in my parish, let them and all of us pray, falling now upon our knees, for the good Bishop of Limerick; none before have done as *he* has done for the poor, never will they have such another benefactor.'" One of Dr. Jebb's medical attendants, Dr. Carroll, a Roman Catholic, could not refrain from expressing the mingled pleasure and edification with which he ministered at the bedside of a Bishop of the Church of England."*

E.—FATHER CRESSY'S VOLUME.

Exomologesis, or Motives, &c., by Hugh Paulin De Cressy, Lately Deane of Laghlin, &c., in Ireland, and Prebend of Windsore, in England. Now a second time printed; with additions and explications by the same Author, who now calls himself *B. Serenus Cressy*, Religious Priest of the Holy Order of S. Benedict in the Convent of S. Gregory in Douay

* Life of John Jebb, D.D., F.R.S., Bishop of Limerick, Ardfert, and Aghadoe. By Rev. Charles Forster, D.D., vol. i., pp. 212, 249, 322, 323, 329, 331.

A Paris, chez Jean Billaine, Rue S. Jacques à l'Ensigne S. Augustin, 1653. Dedicated to the Honourable Walter Montague Esquire, and to the Right Reverend Fathers, the Fathers D.D. Religious of the Holy Order of the Carthusians in the English Convent at Newport in Flanders.

The above work, by Father Cressy, had the Approbation of (i.) Placidus Gascoigne, *Superior of the English Congregation of Benedictines*, after having been read and approved by two theologians of the Congregation, deputed for that purpose, 10th August, 1652; (ii.) H. Holden, *Master in the faculty of Sacred Theology at Paris;* (iii.) a still warmer approbation of the Second Edition by the same H. Holden; (iv.) a warm Approbation of the Second Edition by Fr. Paulus, *Dei Custodiens, S. Theologiæ Doctor et Diffinitor Congregationis Anglo-Ben.* 20 October, 1652; (v.) similar Approbation by Thomas Albius, *S. Theologiæ Professor;* (vi.) similar Approbation by H. Metham, *E. C. V. G. et olim S. Theol. Professor;* (vii.) similar Approbation by T. J., *Sacræ Theologiæ Professor*, October, 1652.

The First Edition of "Exomologesis; or, An Apology for my Reconciliation to the Church of Rome," appeared at Paris in 1647. Father Cressy published also, in 1668, a "Church History of Brittany," which dealt largely with the subjects of Episcopal Sees, Succession of Bishops, Foundation of Monasteries, etc.

Dr. F. G. Lee, in his exhaustive work on Anglican Orders, writes of Cressy, "Afterwards, though he became a Benedictine, he was never re-ordained. The anonymous writer of 'Legenda Lignea' upbraids him with inconsistency, vanity and other sins, in very coarse language. Some years later on, Cressy wrote an 'Epistle Apologeticall to a Person of Honour' (*i.e.*, to his old acquaintance Sir Edward Hyde, then Earl of Clarendon), by whose arguments and recommendations, in conjunction with those of Dr. Hammond and the writings of Mr. Shelford, it is said that he continued to retain an unshaken belief in the validity and goodness of the Ordinations of the Church of England, and to maintain a pleasant literary intercourse with his old associates." Dr. Lee mentions as his authority for this statement, a Letter of Sir Edward Hyde to Dr. John Earles regarding Hugh Cressy, in Clarendon's State Papers, vol. ii., p. 322, Oxford, 1773.

LONDON:
W. I. RICHARDSON, PRINTER, 4 AND 5, GREAT QUEEN STREET,
LINCOLN'S INN FIELDS, W.C.

GTU Library
2400 Ridge Road
Berkeley, CA 94709
For renewals call (510) 649-2500

All items are subject to recall.